

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3758. Also, petition of Ora Upham and 65 other citizens of Lebanon, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3759. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 4 of the Kiwanis International, California-Nevada district, approving the decentralization of governmental agencies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3760. Also, resolution No. 2 of the Kiwanis International, California-Nevada district, opposing return of persons of Japanese ancestry to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3761. Also, resolution of the Building and Construction Trades Council of San Francisco, requesting the National Housing Agency to program allocations to civilians' new homes and that the immigrant war workers directive be set aside for these homes, and that the War Production Board release materials and grant priorities for their construction in accordance with the civilian needs of metropolitan centers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3762. By Mr. KEOGH: Resolution adopted by the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America with reference to the so-called Kilgore-Patman bills; to the Committee on Patents.

3763. Also, resolution adopted by the American Institute of Consulting Engineers with reference to the so-called Kilgore-Patman bills; to the Committee on Patents.

3764. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nitro, W. Va., asking Congress to pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3765. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Jos. C. Walsh and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3766. Also, petition of C. H. Schauwecker and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3767. Also, petition of R. J. Long and 22 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3768. Also, petition of Peter Elsel and signed by 98 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3769. Also, petition of Josephine McMahon and 83 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3770. Also, petition in the form of a telegram submitted by President Morris Shaplor, and Secretary Noah W. Salz, of the Vaad Hoer Council of St. Louis Orthodox Jewry, composed of 21 congregations, urgently urging support of the Rogers-Baldwin resolution creating a commission to formulate and effectuate a plan to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3771. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. R. O. Moore and signed by many other residents of Mason City, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082, commonly known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3772. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of employees of El Paso Natural Gas Co., urging that the present rate for pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act be frozen at the present level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3773. Also, petition of employees of the Zork Hardware Co., of El Paso, Tex., voicing opposition to increase in social-security tax, and approval of freezing the tax at the present rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3774. Also, petition of employees of the El Paso Electric Co., urging that present rate for pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act be frozen at the present level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3775. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Phares E. Reeder, acting executive secretary of the West Virginia State Education Association, Charleston, W. Va., urging the passage of legislation providing Federal aid to the public schools of the Nation; to the Committee on Education.

3776. By Mr. VURSELL: Petition signed by Rev. E. L. Banta, of Jacksonville, Ill., and 1,795 other citizens of Illinois, calling upon the Congress and the Government to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages and to suppress vice in and around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3777. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Brown Swiss Cattle Breeders' Association, requesting a curtailment of Government regulations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3778. Also, petition of the clerk, board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing passage of Senate bill 1257 and House bill 3018; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

3779. Also, petition of the secretary, Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, now that our day of national thanksgiving has passed as an observance we would put not away the garments of praise; but with thankful hearts we would take the cup of salvation and with the grace of gratitude bow in reverence before Thee, the giver of all good.

We thank Thee for all the comrades of the years who have walked and wrought by our side. Especially do we thank Thee for the life and service of our friend and colleague who, after so many faithful years in this Chamber, has suddenly ended his earthly labors. We remember his stalwart form which was but the fitting tabernacle for a personality which radi-

ated kindness and courtesy and an unflinching fidelity to public duty and to the service of the Nation. Comfort those whose hearts are stricken at his going. While we mourn that we shall see his face no more, solemnize us by the uncertainty of our own working day. The hurrying pace of these crowded years frightens and amazes us. Ere ever the day has worn to noon or we have even planned the work we meant to do, the night comes down upon us and we can work no more. We wake to mourn what we have missed, to value most what comes no more.

May we lengthen our brief life by intensity of living, filling swift hours with mighty deeds. Let us hasten to speak that which is within us, lest we be called away before the story is begun. If there is anything Thou hast meant us to do in life, O spare us until we have accomplished it. If there is any kindness we can show, may we not neglect nor defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. And when the shadows gather round us, whether that twilight shall be sooner or later, may we be very near to the eternal morning and to Thee and to those we have loved and lost a while. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 23, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. W. Warren Barbour, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle; S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.;

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce; the Federal Trade Commission and Federal Security Agency (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce; the Federal Trade Commission and Federal Security Agency (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROVISION FOR DEMOBILIZED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT; BILL INTRODUCED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

All of us are concentrating now on the one primary objective of winning this war. But even as we devote our energy and resources to that purpose, we cannot neglect to plan for things to come after victory is won.

The problem of reconverting wartime America to a peacetime basis is one for which we are now laying plans to be submitted to the Congress for action. As I said last July:

The returning soldier and sailor and marine are a part of the problem of demobilizing

the rest of the millions of Americans who have been working and living in a war economy since 1941. * * * But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

At that time I outlined what seemed to be a minimum of action to which the members of our armed forces are entitled over and above that taken for other citizens.

What our service men and women want, more than anything else, is the assurance of satisfactory employment upon their return to civil life. The first task after the war is to provide employment for them and for our demobilized war workers.

There were skeptics who said that our wartime production goals would never be attained. There will also be skeptics who will question our ability to make the necessary plans to meet the problems of unemployment and want after the war. But, I am confident that if industry and labor and Government tackle the problems of economic readjustment after the war with the same unity of purpose and with the same ingenuity, resourcefulness, and boldness that they have employed to such advantage in wartime production, they can solve them.

We must not lower our sights to pre-war levels. The goal after the war should be the maximum utilization of our human and material resources. This is the way to rout the forces of insecurity and unemployment at home as completely as we shall have defeated the forces of tyranny and oppression on the fields of battle.

There are, however, certain measures which merit the immediate attention of the Congress to round out the program already commenced for the special protection of the members of the armed forces.

The Congress has already enacted a generous program of benefits for servicemen and for the widows and dependents of those killed in action.

For example:

1. Under the National Service Life Insurance Act, life insurance at low premium rates is now available to members of the armed forces in amounts not less than \$1,000 and not more than \$10,000 per person. A total of nearly \$90,000,000 of insurance has already been applied for.

2. In addition, provision has been made under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act for the guaranty by the Government of the payment of premiums on commercial policies held by members of the armed forces while in service. Premiums on insurance totaling \$135,582,000 have been guaranteed as a result of 56,276 applications by servicemen for such relief.

3. The Congress has also enacted legislation making provision for the hospitalization and medical care of all veterans of the present war and for the vocational rehabilitation and training of those suffering from disability incurred or aggravated by military service, when such disability results in a vocational

handicap preventing reemployment. Similar provision has been made for the rehabilitation of disabled persons in civil life who, with proper training, can be equipped to play a useful part in the war effort at home. Men who are rejected for military service because of physical or mental defects, or who are discharged from the armed forces because of a disability existing at the time of induction, are thus eligible for such rehabilitation services and training as may be necessary and feasible in order to fit them for useful and gainful employment.

4. By recent legislation our present service men and women have been assured the same pension benefits for death or disability incurred in the line of duty while in active military service as are provided for the veterans of prior wars. The pension rates for the families of those killed in this war were recently increased by the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration will, from time to time, request the consideration by the Congress of various amendments of existing laws which will facilitate administration, and which will correct any defects in our present statutory scheme which experience may disclose. I am confident that the Congress, in line with the historic policy of this Government toward its ill, injured, and disabled service men and women, will provide generous appropriations to the Veterans' Administration with which to carry out these laws.

5. Numerous other measures have been adopted for the protection of our servicemen, such as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against members of the armed forces; the creation of reemployment rights under the Selective Service Act; and the provision for emergency maternity care to the wives and infants of enlisted men.

However, I believe that we must go much further.

We must make provision now to help our returning service men and women bridge the gap from war to peace activity. When the war is over, our men and women in the armed forces will be eager to rejoin their families, get a job, or continue their education, and to pick up the threads of their former lives. They will return at a time when industry will be in the throes of reconversion. Our plans for demobilization of soldiers and sailors must be consistent with our plans for the reconversion of industry and for the creation of employment opportunities for both servicemen and war workers. Already the armed forces have returned many thousands of service men and women to civil life.

The following further steps seem desirable now:

1. To help service men and women tide over the difficult period of readjustment from military to civilian life, mustering-out pay will be needed. It will relieve them of anxiety while they seek private employment or make their personal plans for the future. I therefore recommend to the Congress that it enact legislation and provide funds for the payment of a uniform, reasonable mustering-out pay to all members of the armed forces upon

their honorable discharge or transfer to inactive duty. This pay should not be in a lump sum but on a monthly installment basis.

2. We must anticipate, however, that some members of the armed forces may not be able to obtain employment within a reasonable time after their return to civil life. For them, unemployment allowances should be provided until they can reasonably be absorbed by private industry.

Members of the armed services are not now adequately covered by existing unemployment insurance laws of the States. It is estimated that approximately one-half of them will have no unemployment-insurance protection at all when they leave military service. Benefits payable to those who are covered by State law are unequal, and will vary greatly among the States because of the wide differences in the provisions of the State laws. The protection in many cases will be inadequate. It is plainly a Federal responsibility to provide for the payment of adequate and equitable allowances to those service men and women who are unable to find employment after their demobilization.

For these reasons I recommend to the Congress that a uniform system of allowances for unemployed service men and women be established.

I believe that there should be a fixed and uniform rate of benefit for a fixed period of time for all members of the armed forces who, after leaving the service, are unable to find suitable work. In order to qualify for an unemployment allowance each person should be obliged to register with the United States Employment Service, and, following the usual practice in unemployment insurance, must be willing to accept available and suitable employment, or to engage in a training course to prepare him for such employment. The protection under this system should be continued for an adequate length of time following the period for which mustering-out payment is made.

At present, persons serving in the merchant marine are not insured under State unemployment insurance laws, primarily because the very nature of their employment carries them beyond the confines of any particular State. I believe that the most effective way of protecting maritime workers against postwar unemployment is to enact without delay a Federal maritime unemployment insurance act. There has been in effect since 1933 a railroad unemployment insurance act, and a similar act for maritime workers is long overdue. Marine workers are, however, insured under the existing Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law.

3. Members of the armed forces are not receiving credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law for their period of military service. Credit under the law can be obtained only while a person is engaged in certain specific types of employment. Service in the armed forces is not included in these types. Since the size of the insurance benefits depends upon the total number

of years in which credits are obtained, the exclusion of military service will operate to decrease the old-age retirement benefits which will eventually be payable to service men and women. Furthermore, a large number of persons whose dependents were protected by the survivors' insurance benefits at the time they entered the armed forces, are losing entirely those insurance rights while they are in service.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to make it possible for members of the armed forces to obtain credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law during their period of military service. The burden of this extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to members of the armed forces should be carried by the Federal Government, and the Federal contributions should be uniform for all members of the armed forces irrespective of their rank.

I have already communicated with the Congress requesting the enactment of legislation to provide educational and training opportunities for the members of the armed forces who desire to pursue their studies after their discharge.

The Congress will agree, I am sure, that this time we must have plans and legislation ready for our returning veterans instead of waiting until the last moment. It will give notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 23, 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the introduction of a bill, which I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce out of order.

The time to prepare for peace is before the end of hostilities. There will be many difficult problems to be solved after the last shot is fired on the field of battle. Their solution will not be easy.

We have already raised the largest Army and Navy this country has ever known. Our armed forces are growing each day in strength and numbers. The tasks involved in creating and providing for an Army and Navy of such large proportions have been of unprecedented magnitude. It will be to the everlasting credit of the United States that no difficulty was too great, no problem was insurmountable, with the result that in so small a period of time so much has been accomplished. This is something our enemies had not counted on.

The problems of mobilization for war have been met because we were able to pool our common energies for the task. The problems of demobilization for peace will be just as numerous, just as urgent, and just as critical to the future of our country. These, too, will be solved if we employ our common energies.

One of the problems will be: What will be the position of our servicemen just after they have been demobilized? They will need new civilian clothes to replace the uniforms which they have worn so proudly. Civilian clothes will symbolize to them their return to the pursuits of peace.

They will need to reestablish their homes, to reunite their families. There will be many practical little things that will have to be done in order for them to reestablish the way of life they had to give up when they joined the colors. Many will need some help until they are able to readjust themselves to a manner of life that will seem new, and until our factories and plants will have had time to reconvert to civilian production.

The Government, which provided so well for the mobilization of these men and women, owes both to them and to the country as a whole the duty of arranging for their orderly demobilization.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill to provide for the payment of mustering-out pay to servicemen upon their demobilization from the armed forces. No mustering-out pay would be given to commissioned officers of ranks above that of captain in the Army, since persons of such ranks undoubtedly will have saved sufficiently from their salaries to tide them over the transition period. Likewise, persons who are entitled to be placed on the retirement lists will not be paid any mustering-out pay, since they will be receiving a steady and assured income immediately upon demobilization.

All other servicemen who are not dishonorably discharged, who have served in the armed forces, would receive the sum of \$300 as mustering-out pay, \$100 of which would be payable immediately upon discharge, the remainder in two equal monthly installments. It is believed that such a sum would do much toward enabling the demobilized soldier, sailor, and marine to go through the necessary readjustment period without any undue hardship until they are able to assume their rightful places as self-supporting members of the community.

Provision is also made in the bill for paying to the surviving widow, minor children, or parents the mustering-out pay of any serviceman who dies after discharge but before receiving the full amount.

I believe this bill will be the solution of one of the many problems we will face when the war is over. It is an important first step in easing the return of our boys and girls to civilian life.

I might say, in addition, that the bill applies to members of all the armed services, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as well as to the women's organizations which have become component parts of our armed services.

It applies also to those who have been heretofore discharged. Under the bill the same amount would be paid to them that would be paid to those discharged hereafter.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to introduce the bill, and that it be printed in the body of the Record following the statement I have just made.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1543) to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

Sec. 1. All members of the armed forces of the United States, who shall have been in active service during the present war and who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after December 7, 1941, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out pay: *Provided*, That mustering-out pay shall not be payable to any person who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, holds a commission, either permanent or temporary, of any rank above captain in the Army, or of any equivalent rank in any of the other armed services: *Provided further*, That mustering-out pay shall not be payable to members of the armed forces who, at the time of discharge or relief from active duty, shall be eligible for placement on the retired list.

Sec. 2. Mustering-out pay, for persons eligible under section 1, shall be in the sum of \$300. One hundred dollars of mustering-out pay shall be paid to all eligible persons at the time of discharge or relief from active duty. The remaining amount of mustering-out pay shall be paid in two consecutive monthly installments: *Provided*, That in the case of persons selected for training under the Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1943 all payments under this act shall be suspended during the time that such person has been selected for attendance at an approved educational institution.

Sec. 3. Members of the armed forces entitled to mustering-out pay who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions before the effective date of this act shall receive the first installment of their mustering-out pay 1 month after the effective date of this act.

Sec. 4. If any member of the armed forces, after his discharge or relief from active duty, shall die before receiving the full amount of the mustering-out pay payable to such person, the amount which he would have received had he lived shall be payable to his surviving widow, if any, and if he shall leave no surviving widow, then in equal shares to his minor children, if any, and if he shall leave no surviving widow or minor children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any: *Provided*, That no payments under this act shall be made to any other person.

Sec. 5. The term "member of the armed forces of the United States" as used herein means any member of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall administer this act within their respective services.

Sec. 7. This act may be cited as "The Mustering-out Pay Act of 1943."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted by a convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., and the Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, representing several Baptist conventions, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Graduate Women of the University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., expressing satisfaction with proposed changes in the organic law for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring discontinuance of the discrepancy in required rationed points as between butter and butter substitutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Michigan Board of Aeronautics, protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, until the establishment of peace; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Michigan Retail Institute, Lansing, Mich., protesting against an increase in the social-security-tax rate at the present time; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution transmitted from the chamber of commerce, at Holland, Mich., being a proposed declaration of independence from possible post-war regimentation, adopted by a conference of American small business organizations, representing 200 organizations in 39 States; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2400) to eliminate the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on domestic margarine and relating to license taxes upon manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of margarine; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., endorsing decisions reached by the Moscow Conference, saluting the military accomplishments of the Red Army, and greeting the people of the Soviet Union on their twenty-sixth anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Moms of America (mothers of men in the service) at Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the use of railroad trains exclusively by those whose business thereon has a direct bearing upon the war; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring the preservation of self-government in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the relaxation of Government regulations controlling the manufacture of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Huron County (Mich.) Farm Bureau, favoring action by the Government to identify farm workers so that they may not be placed in the category of slackers in connection with the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Stewards' Body of Local 490, U. A. W. A.-C. I. O., of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Luce bill, being the bill (H. R. 3558) to create an Army and Navy maintenance corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Michigan State Branch of the N. A. P. S., at Three Rivers, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing overtime pay

to postal supervisors; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Committee on Intrastate Cooperation, at Lansing, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 1152) to provide for the conservation of wildlife on public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Moms of America (mothers of men in the service) at Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the adoption of the so-called Ball-Hill-Burton-Hatch resolution, being Senate resolution 114, favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace; ordered to lie on the table.

GENERAL WELFARE AND OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION—PETITION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD the body of a petition signed by 100 members of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, asking support of Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861, relating to general welfare and granting old-age assistance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and the body thereof, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We voters of the Third Congressional District of Indiana petition you as Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of these United States, representing all the people of the United States, to work for and vote for the passage of S. 1161 and H. R. 2861, social-security bills introduced by Messrs. WAGNER, MURRAY, and DINGELL.

We also request this petition be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOOD SUBSIDY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC., INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution passed unanimously at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,

Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

As members of the Indiana Farm Bureau and representing more than 200,000 Indiana farm people, we respectfully present and urge your due consideration of our official and personal concern regarding subsidies as they affect agricultural commodities.

Ceilings on corn, hogs, and cattle, established by Government decree and in direct violation of the Price Stabilization Act of October 1942, have definitely checked the natural upward trend of prices. In the instance of cattle and hog price ceilings, the market, coincident with the announcement of ceiling prices, fell—and to exactly the Government price-ceiling levels. Government-assured floors are ignored to the detriment of both producers and consumers.

Now comes the proposal to subsidize from the Federal Treasury sufficiently to span the gap between ceiling prices and the natural levels comparable to the purchasing ability of the consuming public. We are opposed to this and urge that you vote against increased subsidies for the following reasons:

1. The public has sufficient purchasing power to amply provide all its needs.
2. Reduced living costs through subsidies leave more money in the pockets of consumers to bid for fewer articles.
3. Subsidies will add indebtedness for future generations as well as for our fighting men to pay when they come home.
4. Farmers will help to pay their own subsidies.
5. Subsidies enlarged and more widespread can lead to a Government-controlled agriculture.
6. Ceiling prices were the forerunner for an excuse to subsidize.
7. Subsidies have every tendency to create inflation.
8. Ceiling prices and subsidies will bring about reduced food and fiber in this Nation.
9. Farm people do not desire the finger of scorn pointed toward them as receiving hand-outs from the Federal Treasury.
10. Give us manpower and machinery, a fair price in the market places, and there will be no excuse for subsidies.

This resolution was passed unanimously at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

Again we ask your cooperation against subsidies.

RESOLUTION FAVORING EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION ADOPTED AT PURCELLVILLE, VA.

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. GLASS) presented a resolution adopted by a group of over 100 women attending the post-war women's program presented by the Purcellville Woman's Club, at Purcellville, Va., on November 19, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Virginia Members of Congress.

GENTLEMEN: Whenever the fundamentals of the supreme law are under consideration, it has been the privilege of Virginia's statesmen to be in the front ranks. The Declaration of Independence has become a landmark for reforms in other governments.

The National Constitution, written largely by James Madison in 1787, has been a model for other federal governments. And the status of world neutrality arose from George Washington's 1793 Neutrality Proclamation.

Today women from several Virginia counties have heard not only plans for greater opportunities for post-war women, they have also heard glowing accounts of the rapid infiltration of women into defense plants and battle fronts throughout the world.

From all this we are forced to conclude that if ever we are to build the America of our dreams, this present team play of men and women must become a permanent reality. Women must become full citizens with men. This can be done only by the passage of the equal-rights amendment to the Federal Constitution reading:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

We therefore appeal to our Representatives in Congress to do honor to their statesman ancestors by rising to leadership in the passage of a law endowing for all time the mothers of men with all that great wealth of experience arising out of responsibilities, opportunities, and duties now common to the life of men, enjoying full and unrestricted citizenship.

Mrs. Contee L. Adams, Hamilton; Mrs. William S. Ashbrook, Waterford; Mrs. Henry W. Beatty, Bluemont; Mrs. Frank W. McComb, Bluemont; Mrs. J. Lynn Cornwell, Purcellville; Mrs. Arthur E. Lybolt, Purcellville; Mrs. Gertrude J. Robey, Purcellville; Mrs. Franklin P. Wilson, Purcellville; Mrs. William

G. Fletcher, Upperville; Mrs. Howard A. Gray, Ashburn; Mrs. Richard Lake, Philomont; Mrs. A. D. Neale, Round Hill; Miss Charlotte Noland, Middleburg; Mrs. John T. Owens, Leesburg; Mrs. Jack Potterfield, Lovettsville; Mrs. Mildred R. Shackelford, Unison; Mrs. William T. Smith, Lincoln; Mrs. C. Malcolm Hoge, Lincoln; Mrs. Heyward C. Thompson, Hillsboro, the resolution committee.

PRICE CONTROL, SUBSIDIES, AND INFLATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference, and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a telegram from the city clerk of Detroit reporting upon a resolution adopted by the Detroit Common Council regarding consumer subsidies.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., November 23, 1943.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Member of Congress, Washington D. C.:

The following resolution was adopted by Detroit Common Council in formal session tonight:

Whereas the city of Detroit and its citizens have a tremendous stake in the attempt of our Government to prevent inflation; and

"Whereas if the fight against inflation is lost the Detroit area may well be one of the most seriously affected areas in the country by the consequent competition between prices and wages; and

"Whereas the Common Council of the City of Detroit has had presented to it petitions from city employees asking for general wage increases in the belief that the fight against inflation had been lost, and petitions from citizen's groups requesting our aid in the support of price control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit does hereby petition the Members of the House and Senate from the State of Michigan to give vigorous support to the President of the United States in his fight against inflation, and particularly to join the battle against the proposal now pending before Congress to eliminate the payment of subsidies upon which price control depends."

FOOD-SUBSIDY PROGRAM—LETTER FROM FORD COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from John P. Perrier, county agent of Ford County, Kans., informing me of the action of the Ford County Farm Bureau, which went on record at its meeting on November 15 in opposition to the food-subsidy program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,

Dodge City, Kans., November 20, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a community A. A. A. election meeting held in Ford County, Monday night, November 15, it was voted by the delegation to endorse the action of the farm bloc of Congress and the farm organizations on their stand with regard to the food-subsidy program.

This group is opposed to food subsidies and wanted us to inform you about it.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. PERRIER,
County Agent.

GENERAL SALES TAX—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I present a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the recent annual convention of the North Dakota Farmers Union, stating their position in regard to a general sales tax, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., November 18, 1943.

SENATOR GERALD P. NYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NYE: Following is a portion of the program for 1944 adopted by the recent annual convention of the North Dakota Farmers Union.

Because of the current importance of this section the delegates asked that transmittal be made as soon after the convention as possible to the congressional delegation from North Dakota bearing the request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Following is the convention's position on the general sales tax:

"Stabilization of economy: We recommend our national and State leadership for standing firm for the Farmers Union policy formulated before Pearl Harbor for the complete stabilization of our internal economy and positive control of inflation. We recognize that at all costs we must prevent the repetition of the inflation and resultant deflation following World War No. 1 which caused 1,000,000 American farmers to lose their homes, and eventually caused 16,000,000 workers to lose their jobs.

"To that end we support: Opposition, with every ounce of strength we can muster, to a general sales tax which if passed would be highly inflationary—not deflationary."

Very shortly we will have available the entire program in printed form. We shall forward a copy to you very soon.

Yours very truly,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
A. L. HELLEBUST, Acting Secretary.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS—RESOLUTION BY SOUTH VERDIGRIS LOCAL FARMERS UNION, NO. 1498, MADISON, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter embodying a resolution which I have received from the Madison (Kans.) Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regular meeting of the South Verdigris Local No. 1498, of the Farmers Union, held on November 18, 1943, the following resolution was offered and voted on—25 voted for, none opposed the resolution:

"Resolved, That the members of the South Verdigris Local No. 1498 are opposed to subsidies."

The local voted to send copies of the resolution to Senators Clyde Reed and Arthur Capper, Representatives Edward Rees and William Lambertson, National Farmers Union president, James G. Patton, and the Kansas Union Farmer.

Yours truly,

FRED BANS, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 540); and

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby; without amendment (Rept. No. 541).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1149. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 542).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 195. Resolution requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 543); and

S. Res. 198. Resolution to investigate the matter of the termination of Government procurement contracts; with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Hector H. Perry; without amendment (Rept. No. 544).

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 197. Resolution authorizing the employment of assistants and the expenditure of funds in a proposed investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act (submitted by Mr. SMITH on October 25, 1943); with amendments (Rept. No. 545), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 1543, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1544. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri), introduced Senate bill 1545, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 1546. A bill to amend an Act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK OF MISSOURI:

S. 1547. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1548. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR DEMOBILIZED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce for reference to the Finance Committee and explain briefly a bill carrying out the recommendations made in the President's message regarding social security for servicemen.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1545) to amend the Social Security Act, to give insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act for military service, and to provide unemployment allowances for members of the armed forces after their demobilization, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the bill is in the form of amendments to the Social Security Act. Somewhat similar provisions are written into the broad social-security measure, Senate bill 1161, introduced on June 3 by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself. The technical background of such legislation was discussed at length by the Chairman of the Social Security Board, in memoranda printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 25 and October 26.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Under the bill just introduced, every member of our armed forces receives a credit toward old-age and survivors' insurance under the Social Security Act, for each month of active service since September 16, 1940, the date of the Selective Service Act. The credit is related to a uniform wage base of \$160 per month. The same wage basis was provided for railroad employees now in the armed forces, under 1942 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. The sums needed to cover both the employee and the employer tax contribution, at this rate of wage, are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Trust Fund.

This credit is provided whether or not the serviceman was previously covered by the Social Security Act. It extends to every member of the armed forces, including the Army, Navy, marines, Coast Guard, or any of their components, such as WAVES, WAC's, and SPARS. The only exceptions are members of the armed forces who are already receiving such military service credits under amendments to the Railway Retirement or Civil Service Retirement Acts.

UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES

The bill provides for payment of unemployment allowances for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, occurring during the 15-month period after the individual serviceman or woman is demobilized. No allowance would be paid, however, for any week during which the individual is receiving Federal mustering-out pay or educational allowances, such as provided for in the bill just intro-

duced by the senior Senator from Kentucky.

The unemployment allowance is \$15 a week for a single man or woman, \$5 additional for a dependent wife, and \$2.50 additional for each dependent child. The maximum allowance per week is \$25. The allowance would be paid to every eligible serviceman who is discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after the effective date of this part of the bill. We also make special provision for those demobilized in the recent past, who may become unemployed hereafter.

This benefit is surrounded with the usual safeguards under unemployment insurance laws. The applicant must register with and report to a public employment office, or attend a suitable free training course. Partial wages earned during any week, in excess of \$3 are deducted from the amount of the benefit. No benefit would be paid if the applicant failed to report for suitable work, unless good cause were shown. The bill provides, however, that unemployment allowances should not be cut off if the veteran becomes disabled or ill after a period of unemployment had commenced. This is a modified form of disability insurance, especially necessary for demobilized veterans who have not quite shaken off the strain of military life.

Any serviceman whose claim for an allowance has been denied is entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal and to the usual court review given in unemployment insurance cases.

RELATION TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS

The Social Security Board is authorized to administer the unemployment allowances. The Board may utilize the available facilities and services of other Federal departments and agencies, and may enter into agreements with appropriate State or other public or private agencies or institutions to utilize their services or facilities. However, any State unemployment agency which desires to enter into and operate under such an agreement or cooperative working arrangement shall be permitted to do so, under express provision of the bill.

While the State agencies have their place in the administration of these unemployment allowances, the benefit amount is uniform for every serviceman with the same number of dependents, regardless of the State he came from, the amount he might have received under any State law, or whether he was covered by a State law before he entered military service. This uniformity is a matter of simple justice and equity for those who have served in our armed forces. It is the only sound course available in the present circumstances, with 51 different State laws varying widely as to coverage, amount, and duration of benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing these variations in detail.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selected unemployment compensation data

[Corrected to Aug. 16, 1943]

State	Coverage		Benefits										Financing					Date benefits first payable
	Minimum size of firm coverage ¹	Workers with wage credits in 1942 (in thousands)	Eligibility requirement (minimum earnings or multiple of W. B. A.)	Weekly benefit amount		Percentage distribution of payments for total unemployment, January-December 1942				Maximum duration (*-un-form)	Average actual duration, claimant's exhausting rights, benefit years ending in 1942	Exhaustion ratio for benefit years ending in 1942	Experience rating			Funds available as of June 30, 1943 (in thousands)		
				Fraction of highest quarterly earnings	Minimum	Maximum	Less than \$5	\$5-\$9.99	\$10-\$14.99				\$15 and over	Estimated average employer contribution rate, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with reduced rates, 1943 (40 States)		Percentage of rated employers with rates of less than 1 percent, 1943 (27 States)	
All States		40,600				1.3	25.2	29.7	43.8				1.7	73.5	38.4	\$4,007,524		
Alabama	8	736	\$60 (30x, inc. \$30.01 in 1 quarter).	¹⁴ / ₆	\$2	\$15	10.3	45.8	24.9	19.0	20x	17.0	39.7	¹ / _{1.2}	95.2	43.8	41,893	Jan. 1938
Alaska	8	35	\$125 (25x)	¹⁴ / ₆	5	16		8.4	12.8	78.8	16x	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	3,663	Jan. 1939
Arizona	3	183	\$70 (14x) ²	¹⁰ / ₁₂	5	15		28.2	28.9	42.9	14x	9.8	44.6	¹ / _{2.3}	55.7	(⁹)	10,189	Jan. 1938
Arkansas	1 in 10 days	403	\$66 (22x)	¹⁴ / ₆	3	15	20.0	53.0	17.6	9.4	16x	9.5	46.2	¹ / _{2.2}	70.4	(⁹)	16,928	Jan. 1939
California	4	3,333	\$300	¹⁴ / ₆	10	20		40.0	60.0	23.4	16.7	33.6	¹ / _{2.3}	37.0	(⁹)	263,927	Jan. 1938	
Colorado	8	331	\$150 (30x)	¹⁰ / ₁₂	5	15		41.5	30.3	28.2	16x	(¹¹)	(¹¹)	¹ / _{1.9}	72.1	50.1	21,902	Jan. 1939
Connecticut	4 in 13 weeks	989	\$144	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6	15		30.2	35.8	34.0	11.8x	10.4	22.5	¹ / _{2.1}	85.5	(⁹)	105,463	Jan. 1938
Delaware	1	144	\$200	¹⁴ / ₆	5	18		57.3	26.6	16.1	20x	14.0	50.2	¹ / _{.9}	96.8	75.0	11,663	Jan. 1939
District of Columbia	1 at any time	359	\$150 (25x) ¹²	¹⁴ / ₆	6	20		23.5	35.7	40.7	20x	(⁹)	(⁹)	¹ / _{1.6}	77.3	(¹⁰)	36,898	Jan. 1938
Florida	8	691	\$150 (30x)	¹⁰ / ₁₂	5	15		42.4	32.9	24.6	16x	11.4	52.7	¹ / _{2.2}	70.9	(¹⁰)	25,689	Jan. 1939
Georgia	8	806	\$100 (table: 25x, 30x and 40x, including wages in 2 quarters).	¹⁰ / ₁₂	4	18	9.9	54.8	17.6	17.7	*16x	¹⁰ / _{14.0}	¹⁰ / _{46.2}	¹ / _{2.1}	80.4	(⁹)	45,537	Do.
Hawaii	1	205	\$150 (30x)	¹⁴ / ₆	5	20		47.5	23.6	28.9	*20x	15.7	14.1	¹ / _{1.7}	97.6	34.0	12,988	Do.
Idaho	1 and \$78 in 1 quarter.	¹¹ / ₁₇₈	\$140 (table: 28-52x, including wages in 2 quarters, and at least \$78 in 1 quarter).	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6	18		23.0	48.1	28.9	17x	12.2	33.3	¹ / _{1.6}	(¹⁰)	(¹⁰)	7,916	Sept. 1938
Illinois	6	¹⁷ / _{3,208}	\$225	¹⁴ / ₆	7	18		12.3	31.9	55.8	20x	12.1	30.1	¹ / _{1.3}	80.2	33.3	350,097	July 1939
Indiana	8	1,233	\$250 and \$150 in last 2 quarters.	¹⁴ / ₆	5	18	.2	18.1	32.8	48.9	18x	11.8	35.8	¹ / _{2.2}	60.4	33.7	104,945	Apr. 1938
Iowa	8 in 15 weeks	¹⁷ / ₅₀₄	(15x)	¹⁰ / ₁₂	¹⁸ / ₅	15	.6	41.4	27.7	30.3	15x	8.5	46.7	¹ / _{1.9}	72.6	46.4	24,456	July 1938
Kansas	8	362	\$200 or \$100 in 2 quarters.	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15		37.7	31.0	31.3	16x	10.4	47.6	¹ / _{2.0}	72.0	40.8	29,254	Jan. 1939
Kentucky	8 or \$50 to each of 4 workers during each of 3 quarters.	668	\$200	¹⁰ / ₁₂	5	16	8.6	60.2	23.7	7.5	*16x	16.0	46.0	¹ / _{2.2}	72.7	9.1	58,421	Do.
Louisiana	4	626	\$60 (20x)	¹⁰ / ₁₂	3	18	6.6	50.9	17.7	24.8	20x	(⁹)	(⁹)	¹ / _{1.2}	79.5	39.7	154,438	Do.
Maine	8	273	\$144	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6	18	(¹⁰)	68.6	24.6	6.8	*16x	14.0	21.9	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	18,817	Do.
Maryland	4	833	\$210 (30x)	¹⁴ / ₆	7	20		21.2	31.1	47.7	23x	10.9	44.9	¹ / _{1.6}	77.3	(⁹)	69,105	Do.
Massachusetts	1	1,865	\$150	¹⁴ / ₆	6	18		35.3	33.1	31.6	20x	15.4	47.2	¹ / _{1.2}	79.5	39.7	154,438	Do.
Michigan	8	2,050	\$250 (including wages in 2 quarters).	¹⁴ / ₆	7	18		4.9	18.1	77.0	18x	15.2	26.9	¹ / _{1.2}	79.5	39.7	173,104	July 1938
Minnesota	1 ¹²	653	\$200	¹⁰ / ₁₂	7	20		22.2	36.8	41.0	16x	13.8	42.6	¹ / _{1.7}	77.3	42.4	43,940	Jan. 1938
Mississippi	8	383	\$90 (30x)	¹⁴ / ₆	3	15	10.2	51.6	18.8	19.4	*14x	14.0	43.0	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	12,074	Apr. 1938
Missouri	8	¹⁷ / _{1,173}	\$120 (40x) including wages in 3 quarters. ³	¹⁴ / ₆	3	18	3.4	30.6	24.2	41.8	16x	11.0	41.4	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	99,500	Jan. 1939
Montana	1 or in excess of \$500 in 1 year.	134	\$150	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15		34.9	31.6	33.5	*16x	16.0	32.0	¹ / _{1.7}	77.3	42.4	43,940	Jan. 1938
Nebraska	8	¹¹ / ₂₉₀	\$200	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15		38.1	36.4	25.5	16x	13.9	36.4	¹ / _{2.0}	66.6	39.9	15,015	Jan. 1939
Nevada	1 and \$225 in 1 quarter.	105	\$200 ²²	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15		9.0	28.1	62.9	18x	13.1	37.3	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	5,276	Do.
New Hampshire	4	¹⁷ / ₁₈₃	\$200	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6	24	18	55.5	35.3	9.2	²⁴ / _{18x}	14.9	18.4	¹ / _{2.3}	66.9	0	14,114	Jan. 1938
New Jersey	8	1,755	\$150	¹⁴ / ₆	7	18		18.9	32.1	49.0	18x	²⁰ / _{10.5}	²⁰ / _{39.7}	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	256,692	Jan. 1939
New Mexico	2 in 13 weeks or \$450 in 1 quarter.	¹⁷ / ₁₃₈	\$150 (30x, including \$78 in 1 quarter).	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15	11.2	45.3	21.9	21.6	16x	14.7	35.2	¹ / _{2.1}	60.6	38.0	5,595	Dec. 1938
New York ²⁰	4 in 15 days	¹⁷ / _{5,800}	\$250 (25x) ²¹	¹⁴ / ₆	²⁷ / ₁₀	27	18	23.6	32.2	44.2	²⁷ / _{20x}	13.0	46.6	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	501,004	Jan. 1938
North Carolina	8	¹⁷ / _{1,061}	\$130	¹⁰ / ₁₂	3	15	18.8	65.5	13.1	2.6	*16x	16.0	43.7	¹ / _{2.6}	24.6	.2	60,497	Do.
North Dakota	8	59	\$150 (30x)	¹⁴ / ₆	5	15		41.8	30.7	27.5	*16x	¹³ / _{13.5}	¹³ / _{38.7}	¹ / _{1.8}	74.7	(⁹)	3,253	Jan. 1939
Ohio	3 at any time	2,865	\$160 and 20 weeks employment.	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6	16	.5	21.4	36.4	41.7	*18x	²⁸ / _{18.0}	²⁸ / _{24.3}	¹ / _{1.4}	92.7	41.4	302,002	Do.
Oklahoma	8	¹¹ / ₄₉₁	\$132 (22x)	¹⁴ / ₆	6	16	.1	28.8	28.5	42.6	16x	8.8	56.7	¹ / _{1.5}	80.1	25.3	29,652	Dec. 1938
Oregon	4 on 1 day and \$500 in same quarter.	¹⁷ / ₅₀₃	\$200	6%	10	15		.3	23.3	76.4	16x	6.5	29.6	¹ / _{2.3}	60.7	(⁹)	34,739	Jan. 1938
Pennsylvania	1	4,014	\$100 (\$50 in each of 2 quarters).	¹⁴ / ₆	8	18		32.5	31.3	36.2	16x	9.2	36.5	¹ / _{1.6}	81.6	58.7	393,832	Do.
Rhode Island	4	387	\$100	¹⁰ / ₁₂	6.75	18		20.2	41.5	38.3	20x	9.1	62.6	¹ / _{1.8}	75.7	(⁹)	40,934	Do.
South Carolina	8	481	\$120 (30x; 40x for all amounts above minimum).	¹⁴ / ₆	4	15	14.0	56.5	16.6	12.9	*16x	(⁹)	(⁹)	¹ / _{1.8}	75.7	47.5	24,331	July 1938
South Dakota	8	81	\$126	¹⁰ / ₁₂	7	15	.1	68.6	21.3	10.0	²⁰ / _{16x}	¹⁴ / _{14.0}	¹⁴ / _{31.4}	¹ / _{1.3}	72.4	60.4	4,801	Jan. 1939

Footnotes at end of table.

Selected unemployment compensation data—Continued

State	Coverage		Eligibility requirement ² (minimum earnings or multiple of W. B. A.)	Benefits								Financing						
	Minimum size of firm coverage ¹	Workers with wage credits in 1942 (in thousands)		Weekly benefit amount			Percentage distribution of payments for total unemployment, January-December 1942			Maximum duration (*—unit-form)	Average actual duration, claimants exhausting rights, benefit years ending in 1942	Exhaustion ratio for benefit years ending in 1942	Experience rating			Funds available as of June 30, 1943 (in thousands)	Date benefits first payable	
				Fraction of highest quarterly earnings	Minimum	Maximum	Less than \$5	\$5-\$9.99	\$10-\$14.99				\$15 and over	Estimated average employer contribution rate, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with reduced rates, 1943 (40 States)			Percentage of rated employers with rates less than 1 percent, 1943 (27 States)
Tennessee.....	8.....	710	\$125 (25x; 30x for all amounts above minimum).	²² 1/20	\$5	\$15	0.1	57.5	24.2	18.2	*16x	16.0	42.7	(?)	(?)	(?)	38,301	Jan. 1938
Texas.....	8.....	1,660	\$80 (16x).....	1/20	5	15	-----	60.1	18.9	21.0	16x	9.4	57.3	1.3	94.1	51.6	96,876	Do.
Utah.....	1 and \$140 in calendar quarter.	225	\$150 (30x).....	1/20	5	20	-----	20.2	29.6	50.2	*20x	20.0	25.1	(?)	(?)	(?)	12,968	Do.
Vermont.....	8.....	93	\$180 (30x).....	⁽¹³⁾ 1/20	6	15	.1	49.9	28.2	21.8	18x	13.2	37.0	¹ 2.3	54.0	-----	7,385	Do.
Virginia.....	8.....	891	\$100 (25x).....	1/20	4	15	6.5	51.2	23.5	18.8	16x	13.4	24.3	¹ 1.5	92.6	-----	41,423	Do.
Washington.....	1 at any time.....	¹⁷ 784	\$200.....	1/20	7	15	-----	16.6	27.3	56.1	16x	11.6	17.3	(?)	(?)	(?)	68,835	Jan. 1939
West Virginia.....	8.....	507	\$250.....	⁽¹³⁾ 1/20	7	18	-----	49.0	31.2	19.8	*16x	16.0	31.0	¹ 1.6	85.6	43.5	44,033	Jan. 1938
Wisconsin.....	6 in 18 weeks ²⁰	889	{14 weeks employment.	⁽¹³⁾ 1/20	8	20	-----	24.3	30.3	45.4	{ ¹ 20- { ³⁰ 1/20x	12.7	26.8	1.7	66.8	31.1	92,577	July 1936
Wyoming.....	1 and \$150 in 1 quarter.	¹⁷ 79	\$175 (25x, including \$70 in 1 quarter).	1/20	7	20	-----	19.0	23.3	57.7	16x	10.3	24.5	2.0	65.6	0	4,803	Jan. 1939

¹ Requires employment of specified minimum number of workers in at least 20 weeks except where otherwise stated.
² The dollar amount represents the minimum earnings requirement; where the wage qualification is a multiple of the weekly benefit rate, the multiple is shown in parentheses.
³ The qualifying wages must have been earned in a 1 year base period in all States except the following: Arizona, 3-quarter base period; Missouri, 2-year base period; Oregon, 1-year base period that may be extended up to 2 years.
⁴ Adjusted for duplication arising from employment of individuals in more than one State.
⁵ Based on 34 States.
⁶ Based on 24 States.
⁷ Law provides for maximum contribution rate of 2.7 percent.
⁸ Data not available.
⁹ Experience rating not in effect in 1943; contribution rate is 2.7 percent.
¹⁰ Or 50 percent of full-time weekly wage.
¹¹ State changed from individual to uniform benefit year; therefore, comparable data not available.
¹² Table.
¹³ Lower maximum rates and duration are provided when balance in the fund is less than 2 percent of the pay roll for 3 years ending with the base period for the benefit year.
¹⁴ Data relate to operations under provisions which since have been liberalized; the presently included statistics are the latest available.
¹⁵ Maximum \$250.
¹⁶ Experience rating became effective July 1, 1943.
¹⁷ Estimated by State agency.
¹⁸ Or full-time weekly wage, whichever is the lesser.
¹⁹ Annual table.
²⁰ Less than 0.05 percent.
²¹ Benefit duration for lower wage classes is less.
²² But services for employers not subject to Federal unemployment tax and located outside the corporate limits of a city, village, or borough of 10,000 population are excluded.
²³ Or twice the square of the weekly benefit amount, whichever is greater, and including earnings in either case of five times the weekly benefit amount in some quarter other than that of highest earnings.
²⁴ \$15 maximum weekly benefit amount and maximum duration of 16 weeks if fund fails to equal or exceed \$8,000,000 for 3 successive months.
²⁵ Benefit years ending July-December 1942.
²⁶ Day base plan in effect since November 30, 1942, whereby benefits are paid for accumulations of 4 "effective days" of unemployment instead of weeks of unemployment.
²⁷ Benefits are paid for each accumulation of 4 "effective days." "Effective day" is defined as the fourth and every subsequent day of total unemployment in a week in which not more than \$24 is paid to the individual.
²⁸ For nondisqualified claimants filing on or after Oct. 1, 1941; 12.0 for disqualified claimants.
²⁹ Rate is 1/20 and 1/25 for weekly benefit amounts of \$5 and \$6.
³⁰ Or where employer's records do not permit accurate count, if total annual pay roll is \$6,000 or more.
³¹ Duration depends on continuity of unemployment and number of base-period employers.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on June 3 I inserted in the RECORD several other tables on this point.

About half the servicemen are probably not covered by any of these laws, either because they were in farming or some other excluded occupation, or had not worked long enough in civilian life to earn the necessary credits. As for those who had benefit rights, a few States have made no effort to protect their rights; and most of the others have simply adopted provisions freezing the benefit status. This denies the serviceman the increased credits he would have earned if he remained in civilian employment instead of serving in the armed forces.

Assuming that the serviceman is eligible for State unemployment benefits, he would probably find they were inadequate in amount and were paid for too short a period. A majority of States pay a maximum of \$16 a week. The minimum goes below \$5 in 9 States. Most States stop paying benefits after 16 weeks of unemployment. The effective

maximum duration is often reduced still more because of various technical limitations. As a result, in the 2 years before Pearl Harbor, half the beneficiaries of the State laws exhausted their benefit rights before they had found other jobs.

At present, only the District of Columbia law authorizes added benefits for dependent wives and children. There is only 1 State, Rhode Island, which pays benefits when the man is unemployed because of sickness—the very time when he needs money for doctor's bills.

While Senators may differ about nationalizing the entire unemployment insurance system, I believe that every Senator will see the justice of paying our returning servicemen unemployment allowances on a uniform national basis, as this bill provides.

RELATION TO OTHER VETERAN BENEFITS

The bill makes provision for fair adjustment of the benefits where they duplicate similar benefits paid under some other Federal or State plan to which the claimant has made no direct contributions of his own. For example,

any unemployment compensation benefit received under the usual State law would be subtracted from the allowance payable under this Federal bill. Let me emphasize, however, that this bill does not reduce or eliminate any veteran's allowances or benefits, contributory or noncontributory, available to servicemen or their dependents through the Veterans' Administration by existing law.

ESTIMATES OF COST

It is not possible to give a precisely correct estimate of the sums that would have to be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury for the benefits provided by this bill. The reasons are obvious. We have no way of predicting how long the war will last, when and how rapidly our forces will be demobilized, what the casualty figures will be, how large a standing Army and Navy we will retain after the war, and whether private industry can be ready to absorb these servicemen when they are demobilized. Another uncertain factor is the extent to which servicemen will return to their old jobs, under the partial guaranty of

the Selective Service Act. Undoubtedly, many will try to find new jobs more suitable either to the skill they have obtained in the armed forces, or to the new training and education they may obtain under the excellent bill sponsored by the able senior Senator from Utah (Mr. THOMAS), who, by the way, is beginning his hearings on that particular bill on December 13.

I may say, however, that by any reasonable estimate, the cost of this bill will not exceed our cost of running the war for about 2 weeks during the present fiscal year.

URGENT NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

In closing, I desire to emphasize the necessity for immediate action on this proposed legislation. Since introduction of Senate bill 1161 last June, in public statements and addresses, I have constantly urged prompt consideration of that broad measure, which covered not only the temporary needs of demobilized servicemen, but also the long-range needs of the whole population.

Many sound and necessary measures are under discussion to plan ahead for the period of demobilization and readjustment. That includes plans for canceling Government contracts, disposing of surplus Government property and Government-owned war plants, and building up corporate reserves. Along with those plans, I believe we must develop a broad social-security program to help the average American build up reserves for post-war security, for himself and his family. That is good sense, good finance, and good business.

The sponsors of that broad proposed legislation will continue to press for its full and early consideration.

The bill I have just introduced does not preclude that broad measure, nor is the bill a substitute for it. This bill, however, has great urgency, especially because of the time that has elapsed since introduction of Senate bill 1161, which was some 6 months ago. About 700,000 men have been demobilized since Pearl Harbor, either because of temporary or permanent disability, maladjustment in the armed forces, over age, or other reasons. The number so demobilized is increasing month by month. In addition, there is an increasing number of cases in which the widows and dependents of men killed in action have lost their rights to survivors' insurance, under social security, because the servicemen's credits had been impaired by their absence from civilian employment.

We cannot wait for more advisory councils and more surveys. Here is a bill which makes special retroactive provision for these survivors, for the millions of men and women in service, and for the increasing thousands who are returning to civilian life day by day. Let us, therefore, consider this bill and act upon it without delay.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1545) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

SEC. 101. Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following:

"CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

"SEC. 210. Every member of the armed forces of the United States shall receive a credit at the rate of \$160 per calendar month as wages for employment within the meaning of this title for each month of active service after September 16, 1940: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall not apply to such members of the armed forces who receive credit for such service under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the Railroad Retirement Board after consultation with the Social Security Board, or such members who receive retirement credit for such service under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission after consultation with the Social Security Board.

"APPROPRIATIONS IN LIEU OF EMPLOYER'S AND EMPLOYEE'S TAX

"SEC. 211. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time to the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund amounts equal to the sum of (a) the product of all wages credited to members of the armed forces under section 210 multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 1400) and (b) the product of all such wages multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employers under that act (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 1410).

"DEATH BEFORE PASSAGE OF THE ACT

"SEC. 212. (a) Upon the filing of an application within such period as may be prescribed by the Board, benefits payable with respect to the death of any individual which are based in whole or in part upon credits received under section 210 of this title shall be payable to persons entitled thereto as of the date of the death of any individual who was a member of the armed forces and who died prior to the date of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943.

"(b) In the case of any benefit to which an individual became entitled prior to the effective date of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943, the amount of such benefit may be recomputed to include wages credited under section 210 if such recompensation would increase the amount of the benefit payable to such individual.

"ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

"SEC. 213. (a) Where any benefit is payable to an individual for a month under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and where any Federal noncontributory benefit is payable for the same month with respect to an individual who died or attained the age of 65, the benefit payable under such title shall be adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the benefit payable under such title is greater than that payable under the Federal noncontributory benefit plan the benefit payable under such title shall be reduced by an amount equal to one-half the benefit payable under the Federal noncontributory plan.

"(2) If the benefit payable under such title is equal to or less than the benefit payable under the Federal noncontributory benefit plan the benefit payable under such title shall be reduced by one-half.

"(b) The benefits to be adjusted shall be the final net benefits payable under such title and under a Federal noncontributory benefit plan. Benefits payable under such

title shall be adjusted regardless of any temporary modification of, or delay in, the payment of a benefit under a Federal noncontributory plan.

"(c) No adjustment under this section in any benefit to which an individual had become entitled before the date of enactment of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943 shall reduce such benefit to an amount less than the benefit payable before such date."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE XII

"UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Benefit period and eligibility

"SEC. 1201. (a) Any eligible member of the armed forces of the United States who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after the effective date of this title or within the 52-week period preceding such date shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the Board may prescribe, to receive an allowance for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the 15-month period after he is so discharged or relieved from active duty: *Provided,* That no such allowance shall be paid him during the 4 weeks following the receipt of mustering-out pay under 'the Mustering-Out Pay Act of 1943' or for any period for which he received educational allowances under 'the Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1943.'

"(b) Such member of the armed forces shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if he makes a claim for such allowance and the Board finds with respect to such week that:

"(1) He is residing in the United States at the time of such claim.

"(2) He is completely unemployed in that he has performed no services and received no wages, or he is partially unemployed in that he has performed services for less than a full workweek and his wages for the week are less than his allowance under this title plus \$3.

"(3) He registers with and continues to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Board may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"(4) He is able to work and available for suitable work or is with the approval of the Board attending a training course: *Provided,* That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

"Disqualifications

"SEC. 1202. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201, a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

"(1) He leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or if he is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of his employment;

"(2) He, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work, in accordance with regulations of the Board, or to accept suitable work when offered him;

"(3) He, without good cause, does not attend a free training course, in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201 a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at

which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that:

"1. He is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which caused the stoppage of work; and

"2. He does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of work which are commonly conducted as separate businesses in separate premises are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

"(c) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, the disqualification period shall be the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and the consecutive weeks of unemployment, not more than 4, which immediately followed such week.

"(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his unemployment allowance.

"(2) No work shall be deemed suitable if:

"(a) The position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"(b) The wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality;

"(c) As a condition of being employed, he would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization.

Amount of an allowance

"SEC. 1203. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

"(1) \$15 plus:

"(2) (A) \$5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

"(B) \$7.50 if he has two dependents, or

"(C) \$10 if he has three or more dependents,

less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of \$3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is less than \$1, it shall be raised to \$1.

"(b) (1) As used in this section the term 'dependent' includes only:

"(a) The lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received \$5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law.

"(b) An unmarried child either (i) under 18 years of age, or (ii) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

"(2) As used in this section the term 'child' shall include only:

"(a) A legitimate child;

"(b) A child legally adopted;

"(c) A stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household;

"(d) A child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of claim on behalf of such child.

"(3) The Board may find an individual to be a dependent of a claimant if a claimant certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Board.

"(d) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Board.

Payment

"SEC. 1204. (a) Unemployment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Board.

"(b) Any allowance remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Board may make payment thereof to such person or persons it finds most equitably entitled thereto.

Adjustment of duplicate benefits

"SEC. 1205. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title.

Administration

"SEC. 1206. (a) The Social Security Board, under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator, is authorized to administer this title and to prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as it may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Board may utilize the available facilities and services of other Federal departments and agencies, through agreement with the heads of such departments and agencies, and payment therefor shall be made either in advance or by reimbursement. It may enter into agreements with appropriate State or other public agencies and private persons, agencies, or institutions to utilize their facilities and services with or without compensation: *Provided*, That any State unemployment agency receiving funds under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, desiring to cooperate under such an agreement shall be permitted to do so as long as it functions in accordance with the terms of such agreement. It may delegate to any officer or employee of its own or of any agency of the Federal Government or of any State, such of its powers and duties, except that of prescribing regulations, as it may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. It may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as it may deem necessary, and the cost of such bond may be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

"(c) Allowances shall be paid, upon certification by the Board and in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe. The Board shall also, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as it estimates to be necessary to compensate such agencies, institutions, or persons for their administrative expenses under this

title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Board, to the individuals or agencies designated, the amounts certified pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purposes of this title or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Liability of certifying and disbursing officers

"SEC. 1207. (a) No person designated by the Board as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

"(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Board.

Hearing

"SEC. 1208. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal in accordance with regulations of the Board.

Decisions and procedure

"SEC. 1209. (a) Any decision or certification with respect to an allowance by the Board, or by any agency or person to whom authority to make such decision or certification has been delegated, shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in subsections (g) and (h) of section 205.

"(b) During any hearing, investigation, or other proceedings, the Board and, to the extent the Board determines, any agency or person to whom the Board has delegated such authority may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Insofar as they are applicable to the administration of this title, the Board shall have all the powers and duties conferred upon it by subsections (d), (j), and (k) of section 205 and the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of that section and the provisions of sections 204, 206, and 207 shall be applicable to this title in the same manner and to the same extent as they are applicable to title II.

Requirement of reporting

"SEC. 1210. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for, or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive an allowance for 4 weeks of unemployment thereafter.

Penalties

"SEC. 1211. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received or the period during which earned or paid, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this

title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such a claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"Appropriation authorized"

"SEC. 1212. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.

"Definitions"

"SEC. 1213. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'week' means such period of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Board.

"(b) The term 'United States,' used geographically, means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(c) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(d) The term 'wages' means all remuneration for services from whatever source, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"Effective date"

"SEC. 1214. This title shall become effective 3 calendar months after the month in which the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943 is enacted."

TITLE III

MISCELLANEOUS

Furnishing of information

SEC. 301. Any department or agency of the Federal Government shall, at the request of the Social Security Board, furnish such information with respect to individuals coming within the scope of this act as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

General definitions

SEC. 302. As used in this act—

(a) The term "member of the Armed Forces of the United States" means any member of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

(b) The term "noncontributory benefit" means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners.

Name of act

SEC. 303. This act shall be known as The Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO REVENUE BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WHITE (for Mr. DANAHER) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. DANAHER to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOHN HANSON DAY

Mr. GILLETTE (by request) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas on the 15th day of November 1944 it will be 161 years since the passing of John Hanson, outstanding citizen of the State of Maryland, who ranked foremost among our Nation's colonial patriots, statesmen, and builders; and

Whereas he rendered invaluable service as a civil leader in the hazardous days of the American Revolution, and worked also incessantly and successfully in formulating the American Union of Sovereign States, and in the establishment of American democracy; he made the first successful attempt at establishing our Nation as a civil structure, endowed with perpetuity and necessary governmental functions; and for this he has been rightfully termed the "Father of the Western Domain" and was elevated to the office of first "President of the United States in Congress Assembled" under the specific terms of the Articles of Confederation, but regretfully, under the stress and strain involved in those vast, complicated, and perilous movements, his service and memory have become obscured and forgotten, together with many of the important phases of the history of that period; and

Whereas influential organizations, including a number of students and writers, have become intensely interested in the importance of the events and the activities of the leaders of that period and have devoted years of untiring efforts in especially studying the contributions made by John Hanson, and have successfully and truthfully revealed his unparalleled accomplishments in helping lay the foundation for our national order, and it is now known that he actually began the regime of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"; and

Whereas as President of the United States in Congress assembled, he gave remarkable consideration, without precedent nor guidance, to foreign and domestic state affairs,

which during his term in office resulted in friendship and respect both at home and abroad, and to recognition of the United States by the kingdoms of Sweden and Holland as a new organization in the family nations; he, too, welcomed General Washington to the Congress after his glorious defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown; he issued innumerable valuable state papers, ordered and first used the great seal of the United States; he organized the first Cabinet and named the first members thereof, and, lastly, caused to be prepared the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation, setting aside the last Thursday in November in the year 1782 as Thanksgiving Day; and

Whereas the hallowed resting place of this immortal is unknown, although every effort has been made to determine the location of his grave, suggestions and plans have been proposed for the erection of a monument as a shrine to his memory at Frederick, Md., his home, a place famous for its historic annals and national lore, and any activities in relation thereto should be rightly encouraged; and

Whereas in the present crisis a renewed interest in and a better knowledge of our heritage is vitally important to appreciate the value of liberty and democracy so as to better understand the importance of removing oppression and tyranny among people and destroy dictatorship everywhere; to more fully realize the importance of United States and her allies winning the present struggle aimed at these ends; and to arouse such interest it is believed that steps should be taken to commemorate the life and work of the almost forgotten John Hanson to acquaint our people with his service to this Nation and to mankind; and

Whereas more attention to matters of this nature have a tendency to cause our people to have a better understanding and deeper appreciation of the real value of this Nation, not to our own people alone, but to the entire world: Be it therefore

Resolved, That November 15, 1944, be designated as John Hanson Day, which shall be likewise so termed at each annual anniversary thereafter, and that the Senate and the House be, and are hereby requested to give due recognition thereof by appropriate proceedings.

INVESTIGATION OF PERSONNEL POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 212), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of personnel policies and administration in the Government Printing Office, particularly with respect to the recruitment and promotion of employees, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The

expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF DISCRIMINATORY USE OF RADIO TIME

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 213), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation for the purpose of (1) ascertaining the reasons and the person or persons responsible for the refusal of the National Broadcasting Co. to permit the use of radio time contracted for by representatives of the dairy industry for a program scheduled to be broadcast at 12 o'clock meridian, central war time, on November 21, 1943, and the granting of such time to representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and (2) determining whether the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, should be further amended to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to prevent such discrimination. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR

Mr. HAWKES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for, and attending the funeral of, Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Government, Business, and People," delivered by him at a luncheon of the New York Chapter of the American Marketing Association, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, November 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPENDING BOOM IN FARM PRICES—ARTICLE FROM MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Rocketing Farm Values Bring Fear of Boom," published in the Miami Herald of November 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOODROW WILSON'S PLANS AND IDEALS

[Mrs. CARAWAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Says Woodrow Wilson's Plans and Ideals Have Been Reborn," signed by John Park Cravens, published in the Arkansas Gazette which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR FRENCH AND BELGIANS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "French and Belgians Seeking Food Aid for Homelands Now," published in the New York Herald Tribune of November 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF RHOADS GENERAL HOSPITAL, UTICA, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several speeches made on the occasion of the dedication of the Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, N. Y., on October 30, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Revival of Nationalism," by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of November 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY LOAN DRIVE IN NEW YORK STATE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a letter from Generoso Pope, a statement, and an editorial from *Il Progresso Italo-Americano* of September 10, 1943, pertaining to the Liberty Loan drive in New York State, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDS FOR O. W. I.—EDITORIAL FROM THE CATHOLIC WEEKLY, AMERICA

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Funds for O. W. I." from the October 30, 1943, issue of the Catholic weekly, America, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES—EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidies" written by Hon. Tom Linder and published in the November 17, 1943, issue of the Georgia Farmer's Market Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

DID ISOLATIONISM FAIL?—ARTICLE FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Did Isolationism Fail?" by William Henry Chamberlain, published in the November 22, 1943, issue of the Progressive, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD an unusual letter. I especially direct the attention of any Senator who has in mind the support of the notorious poll-tax bill. The letter was written by the National Republican Committeeman from Mississippi, who is an outstanding lawyer in the city of Washington at the present time. He is a former assistant United States attorney, and he is known to the Republican Party as one of the leading Republicans

and one of the distinguished lawyers at the bar. The letter is such an eye-opener that it should put every Senator and the people of the country on notice of the foolish thing which is being attempted here in the midst of war. The letter was written to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and is dated November 20, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Pursuant to promise at the meeting of the Mu-So-Lit Club last evening, which you addressed so forcibly, effectively, and admirably, I am writing you in reference to the matter of the poll-tax bill.

I wish to most respectfully repeat what I said on last evening, and that is, that the bill so drawn is not worth the paper it is written on so far as it guarantees the colored man a vote in the South, and I base this statement upon the following reasons:

The leading Republican from Mississippi, a Negro, is stating that the bill which is before the Senate is not worth the paper it is written on, if Senators mean by it to guarantee to the Negroes of the South the right to vote. I have been trying to impress that fact on the minds of Senators ever since the bill has been up. Here is authority for Republican Senators from their own household:

1. If one has paid his poll tax for 40 years on time without breaking the continuity, he must register before he can vote.

2. The matter of registration is in the hands of the circuit court clerk and there is no appeal from his decision to the courts when he denies one the right to register.

3. Under the understanding clause, or educational clause, this clerk can arbitrarily use any subterfuge to prevent one from registering, even though he is a graduate of a leading university of the land, a large taxpayer, and one of unimpeachable character.

Therefore, the bill should be amended, and should have the following amendment, to wit: *Provided, however*, That each active political party in a State shall have representation in the matter of registration of voters so that each applicant will be protected in his right to register when he qualifies."

If Senators amend the bill by adding that amendment, of course under all their contentions they would make the bill still further unconstitutional.

The letter continues:

This amendment, if passed, would reconstruct the voting system of the South and make suffrage universal, and at the same time it would maintain a high standard for qualified voters.

May I add that the colored people of the South are willing to pay the poll tax if they are given a chance to register, but they do not wish the farcical performance of paying poll tax but cannot register and vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. No. The letter continues:

Indeed it will be very unfortunate for my people in this country if either political party should succeed in passing this poll-tax bill as drawn for the reason that the party passing it will place upon the shoulders of the American negroes a political debt that it will take more than 50 years to pay when by the passage of the existing bill they are getting nothing in return. I challenge any American to the platform on this issue.

I represent the largest Negro-populated State in the Union, and I have given years of study to the laws of our State and the

South generally, and I want to appeal to you and other Members of this great body that you not hand us a gold brick and take up the time of the Congress with a farcical proceeding.

I wish to add here that the great leaders in Mississippi in the Constitutional Convention of 1890 promised that when they fixed the educational test as a prerequisite for voting that it would be fairly and impartially enforced and in proportion as the colored man measured up he would be permitted to vote. This was promised by such eminent men as Messrs. George and Walthall, but it has not been kept by their successors.

I represent the minority group and I am openly and not secretly asking the leaders of my State to cooperate with you in a matter of simple justice, and not a matter that is revolutionary.

I think the time has come that someone who knows the situation should speak out in frankness at a time when many white and colored leaders are trying to do something in absolute ignorance of the results.

With all good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PERRY W. HOWARD.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Civil Liberties in Memphis" published in the Chicago Sun of November 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN MEMPHIS

Boss Crump of Memphis has gone all out for home-town isolationism. No "blatherskite or demagogue of the North or South," he says, should be permitted to interfere with the friendly relations between white and Negro races in Memphis.

That is the gist of Boss Crump's answer to criticism for having his henchmen intimidate Memphis Negroes into canceling a recently scheduled mass meeting on Negro problems. The meeting was to have been addressed by A. Philip Randolph, president of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and member of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.

Mr. Randolph may be a blatherskite to Mr. Crump—but he is a national leader in the ranks of labor and in the cause of Negro betterment. Doubtless his opposition to the poll tax infuriates Boss Crump, who owes his power in large degree to that indefensible instrument for thwarting and corrupting democracy. Doubtless most things that Mr. Randolph stands for infuriate the czar of Memphis. But for all his zeal in stifling civil liberties in the Randolph case Mr. Crump will lose in the end. Memphis will not permit him to isolate it permanently from the American way of democracy and free speech.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3070, Calendar No. 543, a bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The bill will be

stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is my desire to explain briefly the much-discussed measure dealing with the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws.

Early in May of this year Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, as chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, began hearings on H. R. 1882, introduced by Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York. Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, later introduced H. R. 3070, which we are now considering and which appears to have been based mainly on the facts developed as a result of House hearings on the former bill.

H. R. 3070 having been passed by the House on October 21, 1943, upon coming to the Senate was referred, with S. 1404, introduced by me on September 30, 1943, to the Senate Immigration Committee, whereupon both bills were referred to a subcommittee composed of the Senator, from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and of which I was chairman.

We had several hearings, and on at least two occasions we met with the full Immigration Committee, which resulted in reporting favorably H. R. 3070, which was substituted for S. 1404. It is important to note that H. R. 3070 now comes before the Senate in the same language as when it passed the House. It is hoped that the bill will now receive approval of the Senate without any changes in form or substance, so that it will be immediately enrolled and signed by the President, who has expressed his desire for its passage in messages to Congress.

Inasmuch as there is a rather complete analysis of this bill, section by section, in Committee Report No. 535, Calendar No. 543, I will attempt here to describe, in as few words as possible, the main objectives of each of the three sections of the bill.

Beginning with the year 1882, following an immigration treaty with China of 1880, this Government enacted the first of a long series of laws dealing with the exclusion and deportation of Chinese persons. Some 13 acts, or parts of acts, were enacted on this subject matter between the years 1882 and 1913.

The Chinese are the only persons who were singled out by nationality or origin for discrimination in our immigration laws. It naturally has been a source of embarrassment to the Chinese, because they feel the inference is that the United States has set them apart as an inferior people. It is true that Japanese and Koreans, prior to the basic Quota Act of 1924, were prevented, generally, from

coming to the United States because of the Executive orders of 1907 and 1913, limiting such persons coming to this country.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to call attention to the word "inferior" as used in the Senator's statement. I protest against the use of the word "inferior" in this discussion.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to reply, I am using the language which was used when those exclusion acts were passed. It is not my language. There is no indication or insinuation in my statement of any inferiority.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the Senator will permit this further observation, that idea permeates the entire discussion of immigration, and is particularly applied in considering the restrictive laws on the immigration of the Chinese. I, and those who entertain views on immigration similar to mine, protest against the use of the word "inferior." I do not contend that the Chinese are an inferior race, but they, in large numbers, are incompatible in that their civilization and their racial characteristics are entirely divergent from our own. I base my thoughts on the subject not on the ground of inferiority of any race or group but on the ground of incompatibility when in large unassimilable groups they settle permanently among us.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is also true that natives of all that part of southern Asia coming within the so-called geographically prescribed zone, have not, generally speaking, been admitted to the United States since 1917. But when we search our statutes we find that the Chinese are the only persons who have been classified by native origin and denied the right to enter or remain in this country.

The repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws will not substantially change our basic immigration policy for the following reason: When the Congress passed the act which became effective on July 1, 1924, it put a provision in that act—section 13 (c), to be specific—which provided, in substance, with certain very limited exceptions such as ministers and professors, that no person racially ineligible to naturalization could be admitted to the United States. As a matter of fact, the Chinese exclusion laws could very well have been repealed at that time because this broad provision of the 1924 act, in a comparatively few words, accomplished the major objectives of the various Chinese exclusion laws.

All that section 2 does is to grant an annual quota of 105 to cover all Chinese persons, no matter where they are born. This differs from the present quota laws, in which nativity is almost the sole determining factor as to the quota to which a person may be charged. The Chinese quota is based entirely upon Chinese people as such. In fact, it states that "all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be

allocated to the quota for the Chinese." Under this language, a Chinese coming to the United States as an immigrant to reside permanently shall be charged to the one quota of 105 set aside for persons of the Chinese race, regardless of where they are born.

Fears have been expressed during the course of the committee hearings that persons born outside of China could be charged to the quota of the country in which they were born, or, if born in non-quota countries, such as countries of the Western Hemisphere, could enter regardless of the Chinese quota.

However, a careful reading of the section should dispel that assumption. It merely means that 105 Chinese immigrants, not now entitled to enter the United States, may come here to reside. The committee report carefully states this to be a fact.

I desire to make it clear that the 105 persons permitted to enter the United States under section 2 must, of course, meet all of the mental, moral, physical, and financial standards provided for in existing immigration laws.

All that section 3 does is to make Chinese persons eligible for naturalization. Under the present law, only white persons, African black persons, and "persons of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere," the latter language simply meaning American Indians, are eligible for naturalization. The amendment provided for in section 3 merely adds Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent—and these two terms are interpreted synonymously—as being persons of a race eligible to naturalization. They must also meet all of the existing laws dealing with naturalization, such as the so-called educational requirements, establishment of good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and so forth.

Thus far I have, in a very general way, attempted to tell what is hoped to be accomplished by the bill. As Senators know, hundreds of editorials and news articles have appeared in the newspapers throughout the country since last May, when the House committee began its long series of public hearings. I believe I am safe in saying that practically 95 percent of the newspaper comment has been definitely favorable to legislation of this kind.

The purpose of this bill has been so well publicized that I do not think it is necessary for me to take up much of the time of the Senate in speaking on its merits as a whole. I do wish, however, to quote from the statement made by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, in the House committee hearings. The statement is short, but should of itself be sufficient argument to convince us of the necessity of legislation of this kind at this time. Admiral Yarnell spent a goodly part of his 50 years of service in the Navy in Asiatic stations. I quote Admiral Yarnell:

It is generally appreciated by those who follow the course of the war in the Far East that the main attack on Japan must come from the mainland of Asia. This area is the

only one from which air power adequate to inflict serious or decisive damage to Japanese arsenals and munition plants can operate and from which forces for the invasion of the main Japanese islands can be based.

Russian bases cannot be relied upon since these would probably be occupied by Japanese troops very soon after any war between Japan and Russia began. This is due to the exposed position of the Vladivostok area with reference to the advantageous position of the powerful Japanese Army in Manchuria which renders the successful defense of this area a very difficult operation.

This leaves the mainland of China the only area from which long-range bombers can reach Japan, and leads to the conclusion that Allied success against Japan requires the continuance of China in the war.

It is needless to enlarge upon the desperate situation in China today, and the grave possibility that the Nationalist Government may collapse unless effective aid is given at the earliest possible moment.

The military situation is, of course, known to those in authority in this country and Great Britain, and doubtless every effort is being made to give all possible military assistance.

There are other means, however, of strengthening the determination of the Chinese Government and people to fight on until real and adequate assistance can be given.

The most effective method is to consider, by act as well as word, China as an equal in every respect with the other three Allied Nations in the conduct of the war and in the post-war settlement.

A step in this direction has been made in the announced intention of annulling the treaties regarding extraterritoriality and special privileges.

A greater step will be the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. Such a step will compare with that of the dissolution of the Third International in the effect it will have on the Allied cause.

As you know, Japan has utilized American exclusion laws with much effect in her propaganda campaign in China and other areas of the Far East. By the repeal of these laws, this means of stirring up hatred of the western nations will be eliminated.

At this point I wish to add to the observation of Admiral Yarnell that even since his remarks concerning the propaganda Japan has made of the Chinese exclusion laws, we have been advised that the Japanese radio has continued to broadcast into China, even up to the point of broadcasting the House committee's minority report, word for word, and the names of the five Members who signed that minority report.

I should also like to invite attention to something which will show what occurred recently during the deliberations in the House on this measure. A minority report against this bill was made to the House, signed by five members of the committee. During the discussion on the subject the minority report was brought up. We later learned that the report was broadcast to the world from Tokyo at 11:30 that night, and that the name of each Member who signed the report was given. In other words, what we are doing here now will probably be known in Japan within 6 hours. We do not know who furnishes the information, but it is furnished nevertheless.

I continue to quote from Admiral Yarnell's statement:

In the consideration of the repeal of these laws, we also should look beyond the war to the peace settlement and the years to follow.

When the time for that settlement comes, the four nations that have contributed the most to the defeat of the Axis Powers will have the main task and responsibility of arriving at terms that will insure a durable peace. Each should have an equal voice and there should be no bar which will interfere.

Furthermore, in order to insure peace in the Far East, there must be a strong, stable, and democratic government in China. We have every reason to expect that if the Nationalist regime remains in power in China, we need not fear from that nation a policy of world conquest such as has been the curse of Japan. Chinese tradition, history, and philosophy oppose such policy.

The friendship that has existed between the United States and China for many years must continue in the future if we hope to maintain peace in the world. It cannot continue if these laws are retained on the statute books. Modern China is determined to take her rightful place in the congress of nations. It is our duty and it is to our interest to help her attain that end.

In conclusion it is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery and endurance of a great people, who for 6 years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy.

In conclusion let me also say that from a reading of the bill and a study of our committee report, it will be seen that it is proposed to remove discriminations against the Chinese which have been a source of misunderstanding in the relations between our two peoples for more than 60 years, and have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people.

We are all aware that the original act of exclusion was not born of ill will toward the Chinese people. The moving cause was exclusively economic. But profound changes have taken place in 60 years everywhere over the world.

We have had ample time and abundant occasion to reflect on the finer qualities of the Chinese people. Above all, the tenacity and courage of the Chinese in their terrible ordeal of the last 7 years has impelled a respect that we are proud to acknowledge.

It is clear today that only a few short years stand between the Chinese people and the full use of their vast resources, both human and material, for their own betterment and well-being, free from any outside control. It has always been the policy of the United States to help China in her struggle against encroachment upon her independence and sovereignty, and we are now comrades in arms in that cause. It is fitting, therefore, that the discriminatory legislation, inconsistent with the dignity of both our peoples, should be eliminated.

It is clear that the morale of fighting China will be greatly enhanced by the news of the enactment of this bill, and our chances of an earlier victory against the Japanese would follow as a direct result.

Mr. President, I have many hundreds of resolutions, petitions, and letters from outstanding religious, educational, and other organizations over the United States endorsing and requesting that this

bill be passed. I have received very few, comparatively, against the enactment of the bill. We have given much time and consideration to those who oppose this measure, and I feel that the immense benefits resulting to both China and America by the enactment of this bill far outweigh any disadvantages pointed out by opponents in all the hearings before the committees.

The difference between the term "Chinese persons" as used in section 2, and the term "persons of Chinese descent" as used in section 3, will be found in detailed explanation in that part of the written report under the heading of section 3.

The Immigration Service and the State Department have had a number of informal meetings and have mutually agreed that in the case of mixed blood the term "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent" means "persons who are of as much as one-half Chinese blood and are not as much as one-half blood of a race ineligible for citizenship." In other words, this definition accords with both judicial and administrative interpretations down through the years. It simply means that if a person is as much as one-half Chinese blood with a mixture of other eligible bloods, such as white, black, or American Indian, he will be classed as a Chinese person, both for the purposes of section 2 and section 3 of the bill. However, if he is of as much as one-half of a blood still ineligible to citizenship, such as Jap, Hindu, and so forth, he will be classed as a person racially ineligible to citizenship, and neither admissible to the United States nor admissible to naturalization. In other words, in case of admixture of blood, Chinese persons will be continued to be classified as they have been classed in the past, which is entirely consistent with the purpose of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the message of the President which was sent to Congress favoring the passage of this measure.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this world war first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies, but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan—in ever-increasing

strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 11, 1943.

Mr. ANDREWS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the office of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Francis Biddle, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] endorsing the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1943.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of October 1, 1943, requesting my views relative to a bill (S. 1404) to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, to establish quotas, and to make Chinese residents of the United States eligible for naturalization. The measure would repeal all existing statutory provisions excluding persons of the Chinese race from entry into the United States (sec. 1). It would apply the immigration quota provisions to Chinese, and would allocate all Chinese persons entering the United States as immigrants to the quota for China (sec. 2). The existing naturalization laws, which are limited to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere, would be extended so as to include Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent (sec. 3).

The Chinese exclusion laws were enacted during a period when immigration to this country was not restricted by any quota provisions, the quota limitations having been first introduced into the laws by the Immigration Act of 1924. The quota restrictions are a sufficient protection to this country against excessive immigration, generally, and against the possibility of an unreasonable number of immigrants from any one country. No useful purpose is being served by retaining the Chinese exclusion laws in effect since under the quota provisions the Chinese quota would be only 105 persons annually.

The heroism of the Chinese people has won the respect and admiration of the United Nations. A repeal by the Congress of our antiquated exclusion laws can be an expression of our gratitude and a symbol of our esteem.

Similarly, we should extend to Chinese residents in this country the same eligibility for citizenship that is now given peoples of other nations. While only approximately 45,000 Chinese residents who are in the United States would benefit directly by such action, the good will created would extend to the millions in China who are fighting at our side.

Accordingly, I recommend the enactment of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter from the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, signed by Hon. Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner of Immigration, who endorses the pending bill and gives reasons why it should be passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURAL-
IZATION SERVICE.

Philadelphia, November 12, 1943.

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDREWS: Mr. Shaughnessy has informed me that at two recent meetings, one of the full committee and one of the subcommittee, which met to consider the Bill H. R. 3070, relating to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws, Senator HOLMAN indicated that it had come to his attention that this Service had borrowed an architect from the U. S. Forest Service for the purpose of remodeling abandoned C. C. C. camps into apartments to be used for housing refugees.

To acquaint you and the other members of the Senate Immigration Committee with the facts concerning this matter, I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you to explain the purpose for which we borrowed the services of an architect from the Forest Service, because beyond that one point Senator HOLMAN has been misinformed.

Mr. Shaughnessy being unfamiliar with the details of our alien enemy detention work was not in a position to give your committee the full particulars.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is responsible for the detention of all resident civilian alien enemies who have been ordered interned after apprehension by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, the State Department requested the Department of Justice to provide detention camp space for dangerous alien enemy residents of several Latin-American countries brought to the United States for internment,

pursuant to agreements made between the State Department and the governments of these Latin-American countries. These latter steps were taken and agreements entered into in the interests of hemispheric security. The policy was not determined by the Immigration and Naturalization Service; its only function was to set up and provide detention camp facilities pursuant to request.

The program involves the detention of entire families, since it is the established policy to reunite in family internment camps the families of internees who originated in the United States and its possessions where both husband and wife have been interned and in cases where the separation of the families causes an unusual hardship. In addition some family groups have been brought from Latin-America under the State Department agreements mentioned above.

At the present time we have 2 so-called family camps: 1 at Seagoville, Tex., which can accommodate approximately 500 persons and which is used generally for the detention of single females and childless couples; and the other at Crystal City, Tex., having a capacity of about 3,000 persons where families only are detained. Seagoville is filled very nearly to capacity. At Crystal City there are 1,710 internees and we are due to receive approximately 300 more from Latin America in a few days.

We are committed to accept for internment somewhere between 1,200 and 2,000 additional aliens in family groups from Latin America and must be prepared to accommodate them by March 1, 1944. In addition, there are Japanese families in war relocation centers in the United States numbering approximately 2,300 persons, the heads of which families are in one of this service's internment camps. These Japanese, totaling approximately 3,100, will have to be provided for as soon as possible.

The result is that we must have additional facilities for family internment and we have borrowed an architect from the United States Forest Service to make a study of our camp at Fort Missoula, Mont., which is comprised partly of C. C. C. type barracks, with a view to determining the cost and feasibility of converting Fort Missoula into a family camp for Japanese internees as there is some possibility that the Italian internees now at Fort Missoula will be paroled or released, thus making that camp available for other uses.

This Service is not making a study of C. C. C. camps or any other type of facility with a view to accommodating European or any other class of refugees. We have no knowledge of any such proposal and I cannot imagine how Senator HOLMAN got his information unless he was misinformed as to the purpose of the engineering study we are now having made by the Forest Service architect at Fort Missoula.

I am addressing a similar letter to Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Immigration Committee. I would appreciate it if you would see fit to bring to the attention of the other members of your subcommittee the true facts of the matter.

Sincerely yours,

EARL G. HARRISON,
Commissioner.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Department of State signed E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary, endorsing the measure. If there is any department of our Government which ought to know what the situation is with respect to the subject under discussion, and to be in a position to recommend legislation on the subject, it is the Department of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1943.
The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I refer to your letter of October 1, 1943, requesting the views of the Department concerning S. 1404, "To repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes."

The bill repeals the Chinese exclusion laws and provides that all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be allocated to a quota for China computed under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, with the exception of persons previously lawfully admitted for permanent residence returning from a temporary visit abroad, ministers and professors, their wives and unmarried children under 18 years of age, students entering the United States temporarily for study, and Chinese women who were citizens of the United States and who by reason of marriage, lost such citizenship. The bill provides that a preference up to 75 percent of the quota shall be given to Chinese born and resident in China and that Chinese lawfully admitted as immigrants may become naturalized citizens of this country.

As the bill will remove discriminations against the Chinese which have been a source of misunderstanding in the relations between the United States and China for over 60 years and have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people its enactment is recommended.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.,
Under Secretary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Recently, at a meeting held in Moscow, the Chinese Government was represented, together with Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. The members of the conference promulgated and signed a resolution which, in my judgment, will change the minds of people—particularly the free people of the world. The representative of China was one of those who signed. The four great nations endorsing the resolution are now, and will continue to be, in a position to guarantee the peace of the world when the present terrible scourge is over.

Mr. President, several statements have been made to the effect that the American Legion is not in favor of the pending measure. When it met several months ago it declined to endorse the pending bill or any similar measure. I have before me a telegram addressed to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of our Senate Committee on Immigration, dated November 19, 1943, after a meeting of the American Legion council held in Indianapolis on that date. At that time the Senator from Georgia, who was recently in China, addressed the American Legion council. The telegram, which is signed by Frank Sullivan, and is addressed to the Senator from Georgia, is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., November 19, 1943.
RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senator from Georgia, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

By executive committee action, the American Legion favors the repeal of Chinese exclusion in our immigration laws. The American Legion, however, is mandated to oppose all immigration for permanent residence in the United States until such time as unemployment has dropped to less than 1,000,000.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point something in which all Christian Americans feel a great interest and pride. It is from the president of Wesleyan College, at Macon, Ga. I read:

WESLEYAN COLLEGE,
Macon, Ga., October 8, 1943.
Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I understand you have introduced a bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. I want to commend you for this act and I trust your colleagues will rally to your support and that very quickly this bill may be taken from our statutes. We at Wesleyan are particularly interested in the Chinese people, having had the privilege of having the three Soong sisters study here and the privilege this summer of Mme. Chiang's visit to our campus. As I understand the situation only a very few Chinese would be able to enter under the regular immigration quota should the exclusion law be repealed. Certainly it would be a fine gesture and the right thing for the United States to take this step in connection with its brave Ally. I wanted to let you know that I appreciate what you are doing.

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the Bulletin issued by our alumni office in connection with Mme. Chiang's visit here this summer.

Sincerely yours,

N. C. MCPHERSON, JR.,
President.

By the way, a doctor's degree was conferred upon Mme. Chiang by Wesleyan College. Mme. Chiang is a Christian, as is her husband also. Never since the advent of history has there been a greater opportunity to do something worth while for a great people, whose civilization goes back 3,000 years beyond ours. What an opportunity this is. We must not let it pass.

I have here something which should impress my colleagues. Of course, I have a great deal of material like this, urging the enactment of the pending measure. The petition I hold in my hand is from Samuel McCrae Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and it reads:

DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to show you herewith a copy of a petition signed by about 1,000 leaders in the religious and educational life of America, for the repeal of the measures which discriminate against Chinese, in our immigration and naturalization policies.

Mr. President, I have looked over this petition. It is signed by representatives of the Christian churches in every State of the Union.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he permit a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. The use of the language "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent," which the Senator discussed in the closing part of his formal statement, leads me to propound this inquiry. In the Chosen Peninsula there are, I believe, some 26,000,000 people known as Koreans, closely related to the Chinese, and probably originally from the same stock. Since 1910 the sovereignty over that people has been claimed

by Japan, but a provisional government of the Korean people has been maintained, and now exists. My question is, under the language "persons of Chinese descent," would the elimination of the exclusion provisions extend to the Korean people, or was that considered at all by the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS. I rather think it would not extend to them. The Korean people are now under the Japanese.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under the claimed sovereignty of Japan, but they maintain their provisional government. I just wondered whether the question had been considered.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know that it was, because those people have been under Japan for some time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Since 1910.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think we all hope that when the present war is over, the people in Korea can be restored to their mother country, and be free again.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I share his hope.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in following the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] I do so with a great deal of satisfaction. I shall speak in behalf of the passage of the bill.

As we approach this subject, such a question as that asked by the Senator from Iowa brings to our minds the fact that all questions in regard to the origins of people have by no means been settled. The Korean people will, of course, claim relationship to the great Chinese nationality. The tremendous strength of China, and her great institutions, are to an American very, very satisfying, because China learned how to work out first, and to work them out best, the ordinary fundamentals of what we recognize as democratic institutions.

A couple of generations ago—I almost hesitate to mention the time—I was one of a national committee made up of Americans from all parts of our Nation to seriously enter into a study of our immigration problems. The committee was called the Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation, and after a number of years of study and recommendation the act which is now known as the act of 1924, which established the quota system, became the law of our land. Had that act been passed as it was expected it would be passed, had not an incident in regard to the Japanese arisen at that time, there probably would have been no need today for the bill we are considering. But Senators present remember that there was an unfortunate incident, and, as a result, the Chinese Exclusion Act was expanded, rather than contracted.

At this time especially we are happy to take part in a discussion of the kind now proceeding, because everyone knows that the friendship of China and the friendship of the Chinese people are elements in our own national growth of such value that they cannot be estimated. Let us be sordidly economic for just 1 minute. I wonder if anyone else has ever estimated the buying power of 400,000,000 people. I have done it; I have gone into a study of the question; and that study gave me, at least, a key

to an idea in regard to world prosperity which can be borne out by a perusal of history. For 2,500 years, during the time for which statistics have been available, and for all the time we have been able to trace history, there was prosperity in Europe, and later prosperity in America, so long as trading facilities were normal with the great mass of people included in China. In other words, the buying power and consuming power of the concentrated millions of this earth are such that they take the surpluses of the producing and exporting nations which manufacture many articles from raw materials.

I state that simple fact, Mr. President, because most persons seem to feel that because there have been great panics and depressions in the past after war, panics and depressions will inevitably follow this great war. Judging from the past, some may think we ought to have the greatest of all panics and the greatest of all depressions after this war, because it is the greatest of all wars. But that need not be so, if we approach the subject of rehabilitation in an enlightened way and on the basis of fundamental studies of history and economics.

I am happy that on this day, I can take part in the present debate, and I think I am justified in throwing into the discussion a personal touch. It is now 30 years since I gave my first course on the Orient. For 30 years we have been striving to build that bridge of friendship between the east and west, the building of which now bids fair to contribute so much to the new world.

Mr. President, the problem facing America, which is dealt with in the proposed legislation, cannot be stated more clearly than it was by the President of the United States, in the message he sent to Congress with respect to the proposed legislation, and I would not add to the President's words. But, Mr. President, in considering the pending legislation, and the attempts which are being made to bring about better understanding among nations, so that we may have a better world, I think it is time for the Congress to do things because it is morally right to do them, and not simply do things because it is expedient.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] very wisely and very sensibly rose a moment or two ago when he happened to hear the word "inferior" mentioned in speaking about these people. There are no superior and inferior races, Mr. President. There are races with different habits of life, with different outlooks on life, with racial differences which make them incompatible, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, and there will probably always be an incompatibility between the white and the yellow races so long as they live apart from each other and so long as they follow the habits of their ancestors.

President Wilson was probably the wisest of the men who faced this question at Versailles when the treaty was being considered. The Japanese, it will be remembered, were asking for an article in the Covenant of the League of Nations which would declare racial equality. But our President—and I am

proud that he was able to face the question on the basis of right and justice and with an understanding of history—stated to the Japanese that there was no such thing as racial equality. And since there is no such thing as racial equality, a declaration to that effect in any kind of a document, no matter how universally that doctrine may be preached, will not bring about racial equality. It does not exist. Then President Wilson, with his genius in dealing with the subject, instead of saying "These yellow people are inferior to our people," stated the facts. He said that we could not compete with the yellow man, because of his racial characteristics and racial habits. The yellow man works longer. He sleeps less. He lives on a lower standard. He wants less leisure. He marries earlier. He has more children. All of that may be a sign of strength rather than a sign of weakness. At any rate, the white man feared the onrush of the yellow man, and it was that fear which brought the Exclusion Act. The action was not based on a superiority-inferiority comparison.

But, Mr. President, there are other factors in the world beside the simple factor of doing the right thing at this time for the Chinese people, although that is sufficient argument to justify the passage of the proposed legislation. But there are reasons why it should pass at this particular time. Above all is the reason of that understanding of what we are fighting for, which is becoming so well known in the world. It would have been almost an act of hypocrisy to have adopted the Connally resolution a few weeks ago if we had not theretofore renounced our extraterritorial rights in China, because we would not have been justified in talking about sovereign nations and sovereign states when we ourselves did not recognize the sovereignty of one of the four leading nations engaged on our side in the great contest. We cannot go to the world with a program for the future if we do not settle the differences which exist among ourselves. Now is the time to adjust the differences between the Allies, while we are fighting shoulder to shoulder, and while we see eye to eye with each other.

No one, however, should have an exaggerated idea about the ultimate effects of the proposed legislation. Its enactment does not mean free entry of the Chinese into our country. It does not mean that in the ordinary sense we would lessen the restrictions against the great mass of Chinese who might wish to come to this country. It means merely two things. It means that China will be placed on an equality with other nations so far as the quota system is concerned, and the quota will operate against the Chinese as it does against all nationalities.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. One thing which has bothered me seriously in the consideration of the proposed legislation, both in

the subcommittee and in the full Committee on Immigration, is the doubt as to whether the bill will solve the problem it is presumably intended to solve. Will the bill, in the Senator's opinion, satisfy the Chinese that they are not what one might term "discriminated against"? Does the Senator think the provisions of the bill are sufficiently broad to meet the objection with respect to discrimination which seems to prevail?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I surely believe that the measure is sufficiently broad to meet the objection of discrimination, because under its terms we would treat the Chinese that we treat China in exactly the same way we treat every other country. We do discriminate in our immigration legislation, but we do it in a fair way. We lay down first of all the principle that a certain racial and ethnical compatability exists in the American Nation, and we want to keep it that way. Therefore one nationality does not have an equal chance with another nationality in coming into the United States. Immigration is highly graded. One might think that because of the fact that there are 400,000,000 Chinese, more Chinese should be allowed to come into the country than nationals of other countries, but less are allowed to come in, because immigration rests upon the basis of the stock of the American people. But we do say to China, "We do not exclude your nationals. We treat them in the same way we do those of any other country. The Exclusion Act is repealed." We do not admit the same number of Germans, for example, as English. We do discriminate between various peoples under our immigration legislation, and that would be continued, but we discriminate on the basis of our own ideas, of what we want our national stock to be, instead of on the basis of being against the admission of a given person.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am interested in having the proposed legislation enacted into law, but I wish to have the Record show at this time, if it is possible to do so, something about the selection of immigrants. Who would be entitled under the bill, if enacted into law, to come into the United States? Is there a discrimination among Chinese, based on any regulation or rule?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Probably the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Andrews] would prefer to answer that question, rather than to leave it to me, since he is in charge of the bill. I think it would be better if he answered it. However, I should say there is discrimination.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is very difficult to go into the phases of that matter; but the report the committee has filed with the Senate, and which is now printed and lying on the desks of Senators, I believe, will explain that matter perhaps better than I could do at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the Senator answer as to how many Chinese would be permitted per annum on the present basis?

Mr. ANDREWS. Only 105, but that would merely be making the law as it was before it was changed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the Senator say whether they would be admitted only in the order of the date of their application for admittance?

Mr. ANDREWS. That would depend upon the rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In the United States there are many thousands of Chinese who were born here. They do not know any other country. Many of them are tradesmen. Many of them are men who trade with China. We have our great flow of commerce with China through those tradesmen. Some of those people will be admitted to citizenship, but they will have to stand the literacy test and every other test required of ordinary applicants for admission to citizenship. Those persons are already here. The 105 will merely be those who from time to time may apply for admission, but no more than that number may be admitted in any one year.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would any condition be required of the Chinese, other than conditions with respect to morality, education, health, and such general conditions which are required of other foreign nationals?

Mr. ANDREWS. My understanding is that the requirements made of them would be the same as those made of any other peoples.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the surface point of view it may seem surprising that we are spending time and effort in deliberating over a measure which provides for allowing 105 persons to come into the United States each year. In these critical days we are making momentous decisions affecting continents and hemispheres. We are considering appropriations so huge that the human imagination cannot fully visualize them. We are studying plans for building ships as large as cities, for demolishing areas bigger than one of our States, for transporting masses of soldiers great enough to populate a whole nation.

Yet the Senate finds it worth while to discuss a program involving the entrance into our Nation of 105 people.

It is clear that there is involved in this measure something larger than anything which can be found by a literal reading of its words. There is something larger, even, than is contained in the arguments for and against it, far-reaching though those arguments may be. It is my hope to say something about that larger issue at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has referred to an annual increment of 105 Chinese, I believe, under the terms of the proposed legislation. That number does not disturb me at all. I understand there are approximately forty-odd thousand Chinese in Hawaii and in the United States, some 39,000 of them being in the continental United States. What would the bill do to those persons? Would it make them de jure citizens of the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not, although again I had better let the Senator in charge of the bill reply. I am sure immigration from Hawaii to the United States would be restricted, but I think the Senator from Florida should answer the question in a de jure way.

Mr. WHITE. I was interested in knowing how many of them could become citizens under the proposed law, or how many might hereafter become citizens under the terms of other laws.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, there are many thousands of Chinese who have lived in this country all their lives. In fact, our great trade with China is largely due to the tradesmen who came here from China and who have lived here indefinitely, because under the law they are allowed to live here indefinitely. There are many Chinese who are native-born in the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Are they native-born citizens at the present time, so that the proposed law is not necessary to affect their status? What number in addition to those would become citizens under the terms of the pending bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. My understanding is that as to perhaps 17,000 Chinese who have been in the United States all their lives, and who will be here right along, such of them who might desire to become citizens, and who might have a right to make application for that purpose, would not need to be considered with the quota of 105, because they would be living here anyway.

Mr. WHITE. Then 17,000 could become citizens; but I understand that the Senator assumes that, in fact, because of various reasons, many of them would not become citizens.

Mr. ANDREWS. They would have to stand every test. As I have said, many of them have been here right along, and it would seem only justice that they be permitted to take a part in our Government. That is something which has been thought of a long time, and which has been covered under the pending bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Elaborating, if I may, on the answer to the question relative to the number of Chinese in this country who would be affected by the status of citizenship permitted under the terms of the pending bill, I should like to make a statement; also, I should like the attention of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Andrews], so that he may correct me if we are not in agreement on the

matter. It is my understanding that under the terms of the pending bill approximately 42,000 Chinese would be permitted to become citizens. Five thousand of these are in the Hawaiian Islands. The figures I am giving are approximate ones. Some 20,000, or nearly that many, already are citizens, being native-born; and under the terms of the pending bill the balance, or approximately 17,000, would be permitted to apply for citizenship. Those are the overall figures.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I think what he has stated is correct. I think that regardless of whatever way one looks at the question, whether from the standpoint of nationality or from the standpoint of immigration, he will find that what I have said before is the fact, that under the terms of the pending bill there would be no great letting down of the bars. Every Chinese who might apply for citizenship would have to meet all the requirements which any other person who is naturalized in the United States has to meet—the educational requirements, the question-and-answer requirements, the requirement relative to ability to understand the Constitution of the United States, and the other requirements which are imposed upon those who ask for citizenship after a certain length of residence here.

If one will simply pay attention to the way in which our immigration has worked, if one will realize that immigration into Hawaii was stopped, that immigration of Chinese into the United States was stopped in the 'Eighties of the last century, I think one will realize that since the Wong Kim Ark case, Chinese born in the United States have been citizens of the United States, that already the major portion of the Chinese in the United States are citizens of the United States, and that, providing the quota remains as it is, as time goes on, a lesser number of persons who are eligible will apply for naturalization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that a person of Chinese blood, a member of the Chinese race, but one who was born under the British flag, makes application for citizenship in the United States, would he have a status different from that of a Chinese born in China and who might come to the United States directly from China?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, yes, Mr. President; such a Chinese would come here as a British national, and would come on a British passport.

Mr. AUSTIN. And under a British quota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. He would be, if he were coming in for business purposes. He would come under a British quota. However, under our requirements today, I imagine he would be banned. In such a case the blood question would definitely arise; but I imagine that the matter with which the Senator is dealing would be handled under a different jurisdiction.

Mr. AUSTIN. I happen to know of such instances in the case of persons who are now in the armed services of the British.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That question cannot be covered merely by saying "Chinese." It simply cannot be done. A Chinese protégé, for instance, who comes from such a place as Hongkong is not a Chinese in a political sense at all. Also there are Chinese in the Philippines who are persons of a very different type.

Mr. AUSTIN. Their exclusion under the existing law is made because of their race; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should think so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would the pending bill affect the extinguishment of that cause for exclusion; that is, the racial cause?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what the law does and all it can do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Utah that in the instance which was mentioned by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] the only way in which that Chinese-British national could come in would be under the quota of 105? Certainly I think so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If he were to come in as a Chinese, he would surely be under the quota of 105. If he were to come in as a British citizen, which I do not think he could do, he could have only temporary residence here under a British passport, as our law stands today.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. There certainly is a misunderstanding in the reply of the Senator to the question of the Senator from Vermont. I should like to have the Senator from Florida correct me if I am mistaken. The testimony before the committee was positive to the effect that, regardless of where they may come from, anywhere in the whole wide world or under what conditions, there would be a limit of 105 from the Chinese race admitted to this country in any year. The bill would change the entire philosophy of our present immigration laws from national to racial limitations.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what I tried to say in answering the Senator from Vermont. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has made it plainer.

So far as the pending measure is concerned, there is no opposition to what it will do. The opposition to it is honest and sincere, but it is based on a misapprehension. During the last 25 years I believe I have become qualified to speak on the subject of immigration, for in a modest way I have helped to shape our immigration policy, which protects our American workers against the threat of their employers to import substitutes from overseas whose living standards enable them to accept wages below those which are fair according to the American standard. For many years that protection has been established and maintained, and I would be the last man to

support any movement to alter our immigration policy.

But this measure does not alter that policy. It reaffirms it. It strengthens it. This measure clarifies the sound principle of restrictions on immigration which may bring injury to American workers. It applies the principle to the Chinese people which has proved safe and successful in the case of other peoples. It makes impossible their ever becoming a factor in our economy which can harm our labor structure. The number of Chinese who can be admitted annually under its provisions, 105, speaks for itself.

It is not my intention to go into the arguments for this measure, because others will make them clear. I shall not elaborate on the obvious purpose of the measure, that of being just to the people of China by recognizing openly, as we have already done in the matter of extraterritoriality, that the Chinese have earned the right to be accorded the treatment we accord to citizens of other free and sovereign nations.

I have said again and again that the more international problems we solve before the war is over, the more chance there will be of creating a lasting peace. When the last shot has been fired and the last misshapen, bullet-riddled body has been buried, the whole world will face problems such as have never been known before. If we can arrive at that point with some of our present problems out of the way, our job will be much simpler. That is why I keep repeating that we should do everything we can now.

This measure is an example of something we can do now and should do now to reduce our post-war problems. But it is something besides that. It is a definite, concrete step toward winning the war. It is a military action just as surely as is winning a battle in Italy, occupying Bougainville, or bombing a German munitions center. It is an act of warfare—of that department called psychological warfare, which strengthens our allies and weakens our enemies.

This is the larger issue which I mentioned a moment ago, and I want to speak of it not only as it relates to the measure we are discussing, but also as it relates to our whole prosecution of the war on every front. Unless we understand the power and the importance of psychological warfare, we do not grasp what is going on throughout the world today.

Psychological warfare is sometimes spoken of with a trace of contempt as "the war of words," with the implication that words are of no account when compared to bullets. Particularly in time of war it becomes fashionable to call for action, not phrases; for blows, not speeches; for the sword, not the pen. Yet there is no time when words and the thoughts behind them are more important, when they are more capable of inspiring men to heroic deeds and conversely, of breaking their spirit. There is no time when words become more closely part of the pattern of victory or defeat.

Mr. President, I do not need to refer to our own great commander, General Marshall. Every Senator knows from

experience in the last war and from experiences which he has had in this war, that when we fail to keep up the spirits of men in far-off places who are fighting our battles in the most vulnerable spots in the world, we fail to do our duty to those soldier boys. The plea came from General Marshall that we should not forget the men in India, China, and Persia who are so far removed from the centers. We should write to them. That is part of the psychological warfare in behalf of our own. If we can build up our own and at the same time destroy the morale of our enemy, the battle is half won. After all, the pen is mightier than the sword; and when it is effective it saves lives, not in a small way but by the millions. If the United States, due to the fact that it is unrecognized throughout the world as fighting an unselfish war, can save the lives of our allies as we save the lives of our own men, we shall contribute much to what is being done.

But psychological warfare is not confined to words alone, nor even to thoughts alone. Psychological warfare is action in the realm of the mind and the spirit. I have been struck during the past week with two addresses touching on the subject by two American leaders in this field, Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, and Robert E. Sherwood, Director of the Overseas Branch of that organization. What they said bears repeating, and I shall quote briefly from those addresses.

Speaking before the Herald Tribune Forum on November 16, Robert Sherwood said:

In time of war we dwell quite naturally upon the measurable, tangible power of the weapons that are necessary for the destruction of our enemies. And we are inclined to forget about the immeasurable, intangible spirit that animates those weapons—the spirit of the men who design them, and build them, and use them.

It is that spirit, and that alone, which will achieve a civilized world, if we are ever to have one.

The particular qualities which we associate with the word "pioneer" include, of course, daring and resourcefulness, enterprise, and rugged strength. But the one distinguishing quality, above all others, is faith.

Pioneers discovered and made this country. Columbus, the men and women and children of the *Mayflower*, George Washington and Ben Franklin, Lewis and Clarke and young Abe Lincoln, Walter Reed and Wright brothers, and the thousands and millions of humble people of the steerage—all were pioneers who realized "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

A great Spaniard who became a great American, George Santayana, wrote:

"Columbus found a world and had no chart, Save one that faith deciphered in the skies; To trust the soul's invincible surmise. Was all his science and his only art."

And another great American, Carl Sandburg, the son of an emigrant from Sweden, wrote:

"The Republic is a dream. Nothing happens unless first a dream."

I think that those two quotations contain the very essence of our American faith. We "trust the soul's invincible surmise." We know in our hearts that "nothing happens unless first a dream."

War is generally conceded to be the most thoroughly materialistic of the nonessential activities of man.

There could be nothing less tainted with any consideration of sentimentality than the traditional military precept that "God is always on the side of the heaviest battalions."

And yet Napoleon Bonaparte died—as Adolf Hitler will die and as Benito Mussolini and the war lords of Japan will die—wondering why, when the heaviest battalions were unquestionably on his side, God gave final victory to the other side.

This war, more than any previous war, might be considered a war of tangibles, of mathematical certainties. Computed in terms of these tangibles, we could only observe that our enemies had all the advantage of vastly superior anticipation and preparation and position—and that therefore there was no valid reason why they should not win.

And yet, all along the line that stretched around the world, they were stopped short of final victory. And what stopped them?

Well—future historians may have innumerable theories about this. But it is my belief that they were stopped by nothing more tangible than sheer spiritual superiority—by nothing less than a miracle of faith.

I think there is no one who will disagree with these words of Mr. Sherwood. They stress and teach a profound lesson. No war is fought with weapons alone. No war is fought with the bodies of men alone. Underlying everything else is the spirit which makes men offer their lives on the altar of liberty.

In the present instance, we are face to face with a problem involving the Chinese people as well as ourselves. A realistic statement of our relationship to China was made recently by the Vice President of the United States in a radio address. He said:

China stands with us in this war not by an accident of world politics, or through a grouping of nations into balance-of-power teams. She stands with us and we stand with her because the people of the Chinese Republic and the people of the American Republic believe fundamentally in the same way of life.

In these days it is conventional to say that China needs our help. The fact is not only that we need the help of China as much as she needs ours, but that this war is something more than a matter of donations, contributions, generous aid. It is a mutual action of the nations of the world who believe in the sovereignty of the people in the affairs of life.

That statement is the truth. We in the United States know that it is the truth. But it is our job to show the Chinese that it is the truth. And that is the essence of psychological warfare—to build the spirit of our allies, as well as to weaken that of our enemies.

Due to the length of China's resistance to Japan, China's energies have been inevitably lessened. As a result of her relative physical isolation from her friends due to war developments, and of priorities in supply which have been necessarily given to Europe and other military theatres, China might be expected to develop a feeling of being really alone, waging a war against too great odds and which she could never expect to win. Japan could be expected to find in this feeling something on which to play to weaken the Chinese in continuing an already long and inevitably depleting resistance. Under the circumstances, it is necessary for those with whom China is united to do whatever can be done to

maintain the feeling in China of the certainty of her ultimate success and her common participation in a common effort, on the outcome of which China's future as a great State depends.

Last week Elmer Davis addressed the members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. He outlined the specific functions of psychological warfare in using propaganda, and gave some historical examples. I shall read a part of what he said:

The functions of our Overseas Branch are various—to give to our allies and the neutral nations as much news as possible about the American war effort, and as complete an understanding as possible of what America is like, in the conviction that that understanding will promote not only a closer cooperation among the United Nations and a speedier victory, but will enhance the good will felt toward this country abroad, and will consequently promote American interests not only in the war, but in the peace that will follow.

In those Allied countries where American troops are stationed, it is our task to try to make the inhabitants regard those troops as friends who should be welcome and who deserve the highest degree of cooperation. In the occupied countries we conduct propaganda—by radio, by leaflets dropped from planes, and by other methods—to convince them that the hour of liberation is drawing nearer, that the enemy's cause is certainly and irrevocably lost, that the war will end in victory and the restoration of freedom.

And to the enemy countries we send the message that their downfall is certain and ineluctable, that the mass of their populations is being compelled to fight a hopeless war whose continuance can serve the interest of no one but the leaders so stained with crime that they dare not surrender. More and more of our work overseas, from now on, will be conducted in support of military operations—front-line propaganda against enemy troops, long-range propaganda against the enemy populations behind them, and simultaneous encouragement to the people of the occupied nations who will be liberated by our advancing armies. In that field we have already been conspicuously successful in the Mediterranean theater—a fact to which we have the testimony of General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Cunningham, and of enemy leaders too. We hope presently to attain an equal degree of success in other theaters of war, soon to be opened.

Propaganda does not win wars by itself; wars are won primarily by fighting. But propaganda—or psychological warfare, or political warfare, as it is now the fashion to call it—is a powerful adjunct to the operations of armies, both offensive and defensive; it can cushion the effects of defeat—as O. W. I. propaganda did in the Near East and India in the summer of 1942—and it can bring about a speedier victory, to the considerable saving of lives and money.

This is an old story. The armies of Xerxes, 2,500 years ago, were preceded by rumor spreaders who tried to scare the Greeks with stories that when the Persians shot off their arrows they blotted out the light of the sun; but most of the Greeks of those days were as impervious as their modern descendants to the propaganda of the despotic invader.

The unparalleled conquests of Genghis Khan were due partly to novel tactics, but almost as much to an excellent intelligence and propaganda service which brought enemy armies into the field against him half beaten before the battle started. And, in modern times, we are all familiar with the enormous effectiveness of German propaganda in bringing about the fall of France in 1940.

Happily, modern examples no longer need to be drawn from the enemy. After the surrender of Italy, the Japanese Government broadcast to its people that this was the result of American and British propaganda, and warned them to be on their guard against the same demoralizing attack. And Adolf Hitler, speaking in Munich on the 8th of this month, observed that Germany's enemies are trying to wear down the German people with propaganda, I quote, "trying to create the impression among the German people and even more among the people of Germany's allies not only that the war is already decided"—against Germany, naturally—"but that in Germany and its allied nations great masses are longing for this development to occur." Well, that is exactly what we are trying to do; Mr. Hitler must be one of our listeners. It is true that Hitler says that nobody in Germany believes us except maybe some few criminals, and that he will take care of them; he will cut off their heads. He is cutting off their heads every day—the heads of people who are hearing our propaganda, and believing it, and telling other Germans about it; he would not so passionately declare that the collapse of 1918 will not be repeated this time if he were not afraid that there is really a considerable danger of something of the sort, that even a nazified Germany has lost its will to victory.

To Mr. Davis' example of Hitler's understanding of the power of psychological warfare I can add the testimony of Hitler's counterpart in Japan, Premier Tojo, given at just about the time Mr. Davis was delivering his address in San Francisco. To be exact, it was the day before, November 18, that Premier Tojo spoke at a luncheon given to delegates to a press convention in Tokyo. These men had been corralled from all parts of the empire, and occupied areas, to plan future Japanese propaganda. In a broadcast describing Tojo's speech, Domei, the Japanese news service, stated:

He emphasized that successful prosecution of "thought warfare" * * * side by side with armed war is vitally necessary for ultimate victory as well as for building up greater east Asia.

* And then on the next day the puppet journalists issued a declaration of principles which acknowledged the effect of American and English propaganda throughout the Far East in these words:

In spite of the * * * propaganda of the United States and Britain, which cannot be made light of—

I repeat—

which cannot be made light of, our conviction in the successful prosecution of the war of greater east Asia and the construction of greater east Asia grows firmer than ever.

It is sometimes stated that whereas psychological warfare has been overwhelmingly successful against the Italians, and is becoming increasingly successful against the Germans, it will never have any effect against the Japanese. It is stated that they have become too thoroughly indoctrinated with their own propaganda to pay any attention to propaganda from us. I should like to remind my colleagues that the same thing was said about the Italians, who had been subjected to 23 years of Fascist propaganda, and it was said of the Ger-

mans, who for 10 years had been stuffed with the lies of Hitler and Mussolini.

Regarding the Japanese, I should like to cite the testimony of a gentleman who knows those people better than almost any other living American—Ambassador Joseph P. Grew, who served this country with such great honor and distinction as Ambassador to Japan for the 7 fateful years preceding Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Grew has no illusions that the Japanese are soft. He has done much to inform this country of the toughness of the job we face in the war in the Far East. But Mr. Grew has stated:

I have no doubt that when our bombers start regular routine flights over the military objectives of the main island of Japan the Japanese Government will fear the dropping of pamphlets almost as much as they dread the dropping of bombs. The Japanese people can be made free by the truth, and Japan's militarists know it.

Admittedly, it will take a long time for our propaganda to achieve demoralization of the Japanese people—just as it will take a long time for our armed forces to destroy their military power. Then those of us who know Japan as Ambassador Grew knows Japan, can agree with him that even in those Asiatic islands "the truth is mighty and will prevail."

Japanese propaganda broadcasts, to which this Government listens constantly and with most careful attention, have revealed over and over again the sensitivity of the Japanese to our American propaganda. They frequently attack the Office of War Information by name—and they certainly would not make such attacks if they did not consider that the O. W. I. is wielding a weapon that is highly injurious to them. For instance, here is a quotation from one Japanese propaganda broadcast from Tokyo:

Okumura, vice president of the board of information, explained as follows in today's regular vice minister's meeting about the organization of the American Office of War Information and its propaganda policy; and revealing the true nature of America's propaganda schemes which have recently become very active, he issued a warning to the people of the nation.

The Office (O. W. I.) is emphasizing that speedy victory in this World War lies with America and Britain and the main strength of propaganda is devoted to creating this impression in many ways. Consequently, in spite of defeats in various battles, the point that America's national strength is very enormous is being propagandized. In this manner the plans for propaganda of America and Britain are centered on impressing everyone at home and abroad with the magnificence of their nations.

As against the Axis Nations of Japan, Germany, Italy, and others, they are strengthening the war of nerves which follows along with a war of long duration and are planning internal confusion by spreading false propaganda in an even more lively manner. Consequently, if false propaganda not based on truth arises in our (Japanese) ranks regarding uneasiness over the war situation or criticism of our (Japanese) war leaders, to believe in it will in itself be falling prey to the propaganda schemes of enemy countries. Therefore, the people of this nation (Japan) must not be seduced by such false propa-

ganda, must cooperate as one, and fight to the end to win in this war of thought.

Mr. President, I am neither an expert nor an authority on psychological warfare, but all of us whose words appear in print or are heard over the radio are learning that every word we say is—for good or for bad, consciously or unconsciously—part of America's psychological warfare overseas. Our allies hear it almost instantly, either from our Government programs or from the enemy's programs. In all our expressions, we are talking to the world. The discussion of the proposed repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act on this floor is being listened to not only by ourselves, by visitors in the gallery, by American press and radio representatives, but by all the nations with whom and against whom we are fighting.

Not long ago Representative JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, told the House how within 24 hours the Tokyo radio broadcasting with great approbation an attack on the Office of War Information made by an American newspaper columnist—an attack which, incidentally, was entirely false. This is only one of hundreds of instances of the same nature, in a good many of which, I regret to say, Members of Congress have been praised and quoted at length by Tokyo and Berlin.

But that is the negative side of the psychological warfare in which we participate. The positive side is far more significant. Like a great many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House, of all parties and political views, I have had the privilege of cooperating actively with the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. in the preparation and dissemination of positive statements which form an important part of the propaganda pattern. We, too, are quoted on the enemy radio—not so much quoted as denounced, and denounced in terms so vigorous as to be almost, but not quite, terrifying.

I cannot help smiling a bit when I re-read those words and recall two incidents. About the time of the third of my broadcasts to Japan, which went out on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor under my name, the Japanese officers described me as "Public enemy No. 2." Along about the seventh or eighth or ninth I received information in the most round-about way, through Lisbon, away over in Europe, how the Japanese word came back to us. There the Japanese propagandist told the truth. He said that no one need pay any attention to this Senator THOMAS of Utah, that in reality he was not a real Senator, that he was just a Senator by accident, that he did not stand with the other Senators in any way, that he was merely a broken-down school teacher, and that they did not have to listen to him.

Mr. President, it is fine to be elevated in the minds of the Japanese from the place of general public enemy No. 2 to just a "broken-down school teacher." If I could find the Japanese who said that—likely he was one of my students—I would agree with him and would thank

him. I take great pride in being an "old broken-down school teacher."

My practical knowledge of psychological warfare is made up of my personal experiences in preparing messages which have been published in newspapers in many neutral and Allied countries and which have been broadcast throughout the world.

On the 7th of December my twenty-fourth monthly message to the people of Japan will be broadcast in Japanese to Japan, and will also be published in Japanese-language newspapers in Hawaii. What precise effect these messages have had will probably never be known, but I was greatly pleased at the time of the first to read the following description in an editorial in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*:

A few weeks ago a Tokyo short-wave station broke into a broadcast from KGEI with the announcement that Japanese bombers had caused great damage in San Francisco. Probably there is nothing they would desire more than an air raid that would silence this station, which continues to broadcast information and deny false reports circulated by the enemy.

Doubtless one of the most remarkable incidents in this radio offensive was an address delivered some days ago by Senator THOMAS of Utah. Addressing the Japanese people in their own language he warned them that they were heading toward ultimate disaster by fighting the United States and that their early victories would be followed by defeats from which they would never recover.

Besides the broadcast to Japan, I have prepared many messages to the people of China, a people who know me, and who believe my sincere statements about our cooperation with China. Today I have quoted the enemy in admissions of the power of psychological propaganda. It is equally impressive to see how our expressions of friendship and unity with our allies help them in their struggle for a mutual victory. An example of this was contained in a broadcast to the Chinese people from Chungking some time ago. It was a national anniversary, and China had received from the United States and others of the United Nations messages telling of the determination and the responsibility of all of us to do our part in winning the war.

That such messages are more than bouquets of flowers—that they produce military results—is shown by the words of the Chinese speaker to his fellow countrymen, which I quote:

Numerous messages sent to China on this anniversary by both government and public leaders of our allies are encouraging indeed. It is our belief that the best way to make ourselves worthy of their praise is to redouble our war effort. I hope every Chinese, irrespective of age or sex, does not fail to respond to the Government's call to contribute wholly to the further prosecution of the war on the Asiatic mainland—responsibility for which rests essentially on our shoulders.

Mr. President, I know from personal experience that the renunciation of the extraterritorial treaties by our country was heralded in China as one of the greatest of all victories. It was the achievement of the long, hard work of Sun Yat-sen, and China seemed to feel

that one of the objectives of her great revolution had been attained. Every Chinese throughout the whole republic had a chance to hear the words, the greatest unifying element, probably, that has ever come to that widely scattered people.

I have been privileged also to prepare a large number of statements and messages for European nations, among them Greece and Yugoslavia. Peoples who have escaped from these two latter tortured countries have informed us that such messages by American legislators and other officials are a great comfort and encouragement to the stricken people. They are gratified by the fact that we appreciate their continued resistance to the brutal invaders. I have sent similar messages to Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Norway, the Netherlands, and other occupied countries, as well as to such countries as Iceland and Turkey.

In the case of Turkey, a few months ago a number of statements by some colleagues in the Senate and myself were published in the Turkish press. They were congratulatory messages on the occasion of the unanimous reelection of the President of Turkey, messages evidencing our sincere interest in the problems of Turkey.

When, a few days later in a session of the Turkish National Assembly, reference was made by the Turkish Foreign Minister to these statements by American legislators, according to the Associated Press, a 5-minute enthusiastic ovation greeted the words of the Turkish statesman. The Turkish legislators stood in honor of the United States and applauded happily, acclaiming the keen interest of the American legislators in Turkish problems. I am informed that at that time German Minister of Finance and Commerce, Dr. Klodius, was in Turkey trying to secure all of Turkey's output of chromium for Germany. The dismal failure of his mission is now a matter of historic record.

I have said that psychological propaganda is action in the realm of the mind and spirit. It takes many forms, from leaflets which induce enemy soldiers to surrender in the heat of battle, to the type of congratulations I have been mentioning; from powerful thrusts at discouraged workers in enemy countries which weaken their resolution and slow their production, to instructions at the right moment to the underground which bring on sabotage and revolt. All of these are valuable. All are essential.

I want to make public for the first time one of the many actions of the Office of War Information about which most of us never hear, because it is the job of the O. W. I. not to talk about itself to the American people, but instead to talk about the war to the rest of the world. It was just an incident in the day-by-day work of the O. W. I., but it seems to me impressive in showing psychological warfare in action.

Last year on the anniversary of the delivery of the Gettysburg Address by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, the O. W. I. decided to broadcast its text throughout

the world. This document of 267 words has probably stirred more human hearts in the cause of freedom than any other. Moreover, it is as fresh and vivid today as when it was first delivered.

Accordingly, the Library of Congress was searched for translations of the Gettysburg Address into foreign languages. It was amazing to find out that in a majority of languages no translation was available, either because it had never been made or could not be found by librarians and members of foreign embassies and legations. With this discovery, it became all the more important to broadcast this fundamental document of democracy to the world.

So the O. W. I. translators were put to work on it, and on the appointed day, 79 years after Abraham Lincoln had electrified the Nation with its profound appeal, millions of people scattered over the world heard it for the first time in one of the 46 languages and dialects which are used for short-wave broadcasts. Listeners in Germany, Japan, and Fascist Italy, secretly defying their totalitarian masters, heard the gospel of human liberty proclaimed, filled with the same spirit that emboldened the slaves of Rome to listen to the words of Spartacus in ages gone by.

There is something deeply moving to me in the thought of men and women in Siam and in Iceland, in Norway, and in the struggling Republic of China, everywhere in the world, listening to the simple eloquence which we Americans know so well, but which was entirely new to many of them.

Most of it might well have been written yesterday. Its second sentence, "Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure," certainly applies to the World War of today. And its assurance "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth," is being reinforced by the United Nations offensives over the world which are leading the enemies of the people to unconditional surrender.

As I have pointed out, the measure which we are considering today, and what we say and do about it, are a part of the psychological warfare we are waging against Germany and Japan. Its passage will signify that we mean what we say when we talk about justice and the sovereignty of free nations.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Immigration. He is ill and not able to be present to make his representations in person with respect to the bill now under discussion, which he opposes. He has requested me to indicate for the record his opposition to the bill and to ask that a statement made by him on the subject before the Committee on Immigration, together with a prepared statement of factual matter entitled "The Story of Legislation on Oriental Labor," which he has prepared, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

My opposition to the pending bill does not indicate a lack of appreciation for the courageous fight of the Chinese people to preserve their independence. Nor is it inspired by any prejudice toward the Chinese at home or abroad.

Apropos of this thought, I venture to quote the great philosopher, Mr. Hu Shih, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, who concluded a notable address with this sage admonition: "Those who differ with you and energetically oppose your point of view are not necessarily stupid or evil-minded."

And at the outset I want to make it emphatically clear that my position, and that of those who appear here in my behalf, does not imply in any degree inferiority of the Chinese race in those matters to which they give their attention. It is on the very ground of this superiority in what is known as squatting occupations that the Chinese demonstrate their superiority.

It is well known, of course, that California has borne the brunt of the long struggle for effective Asiatic exclusion. The working people of California were the pioneers in urging legislation to exclude Asiatics. When California, as a State, had accepted this policy there still remained the task of converting the Nation. The vast majority of immigrants from Asia have landed and remained in California. This situation has had a tendency to prolong the struggle. If Californians had been able to legislate on the subject, it would have been settled in 1858, when the State legislature passed a rigid Chinese Exclusion Act. Of course, that law and all other State laws of similar nature were unconstitutional.

In considering early history of the anti-Asiatic movement it is interesting to note that while our first treaty with China was signed in 1884 the anti-Chinese agitation was in full swing in California at the very time when Commodore Perry made his first visit to Japan and attempted to persuade that country to do business with the world at large.

The demand for a Chinese exclusion law was based upon the first law of nature: Self-preservation. The advance guard of China's 400,000,000 were beginning to move across the Pacific, to a land of milk and honey, largely undeveloped and sparsely settled. There are those who now maintain that Chinese immigrants never were a menace to our country but the record speaks for itself. Without restriction, the teeming population of China could have literally overwhelmed our western shores in an incredibly short period. The opposition to Chinese immigration was not a racial but wholly an economic issue.

For three decades, the white residents of California and adjacent States tried out every conceivable method to discourage Chinese immigration. There was an unending series of discriminatory State laws and city ordinances. There were anti-Chinese demonstrations, riots, and persecutions without number. California in 1879 and Nevada in 1880 each took a State-wide referendum vote on the subject. The results were virtually unanimous for exclusion. In the end the realization came that Federal legislation was the only remedy. An energetic campaign was carried on and Congress responded by passing regulatory measures as substitutes for exclusion. Among such was a bill providing that no master of a vessel should take aboard more than 15 Chinese passengers bound for a United States port. The bill was promptly vetoed by President Hayes. However, because of the constantly increasing political pressure from the Pacific coast the President negotiated a new treaty with China which enabled Congress to restrict immigration from China. A bill excluding Chinese laborers for a period

of 20 years was passed by Congress early in 1882. President Arthur vetoed this bill because he felt that the 20-year period was too long and that it violated the spirit of the treaty with China. Congress took the hint and passed another bill providing for a 10-year exclusion period only. The exclusion law of 1882 did not prove entirely satisfactory. There were too many loopholes.

So the agitation went on. Additional restrictions were added during the next Congress. And when the 10-year exclusion law was renewed in 1892, still more restrictive features were adopted. In 1902 Congress renewed for an indefinite period all the laws prohibiting and regulating the coming of Chinese.

Upon the refusal of China to continue the then existing treaty after 1904, Congress on April 27, 1904, again reenacted, "extending and continuing without modification, limitation, or condition," all restrictive laws then in force.

The Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, did not disturb the Chinese Exclusion Act but added virtually all other Asiatics to the excluded classes by geographical definition of a barred zone. The restricted area thus established added to the excluded classes the natives of India, Siam, Indochina and the islands of New Guinea, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, as well as numerous lesser islands.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Japanese immigration became an issue during the early years of the present century. The anti-Japanese agitation was mild and innocuous in comparison with the violent anti-Chinese movement that had raged in the coast States for several decades.

The Japanese Government showed extraordinary readiness to guard and protect the rights and privileges of her nationals residing in the United States. As the years rolled by the reason of this paternal solicitude of the Japanese Government became thoroughly understood in California, at least. Japanese immigrants did not come to America with any desire or intent to lose their racial or national identity. They came in ever-increasing numbers for the purpose of establishing self-sustaining colonies of the proud Yamato race. And when we pause to think of the congested area of Japan it is really not surprising that so many were ready to venture across the Pacific.

When and where in all history was there a more glorious opportunity or a more promising prospect than California offered to Japan? Both have approximately the same area. But Japan had 390 inhabitants to the square mile while California had only 15. It was the fear of this new menace from the Orient that caused Californians of all classes to unite in the demand for Japanese exclusion legislation of the same sort as existed for the Chinese.

President Theodore Roosevelt strenuously opposed Japanese exclusion by law. In a message to Congress he also recommended that the privilege of naturalization be extended to Japanese who are residents of the United States. Finally, as a substitute for an exclusion law, President Roosevelt in 1907 negotiated a gentlemen's agreement with Japan.

In substance, this agreement provided that the United States would not adopt a law excluding Japanese. In return, Japan of her own accord agreed to refrain from issuing passports to Japanese laborers desiring to enter continental United States or Territories contiguous to continental United States.

This substitute for exclusion took effect about the middle of 1908, but it did not put an end to the anti-Japanese agitation among the residents of the Pacific slope. The agreement did not produce the results anticipated and promised by President Roosevelt.

Investigations made by the California State Board of Control showed that the Japanese population of California increased during the decade 1910-20 by more than 25,000 from immigration only. During the same period the net increase of the Chinese population, including births, was only 789. In other words, the Chinese Exclusion Act actually excluded. The Japanese gentlemen's agreement did not.

So the insistent demand for effective exclusion found an answer when Congress wrote in the Immigration Act of 1924 a clause providing that "no alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States."

Exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship offered a logical, simple, practical, and effective solution of the entire Asiatic immigration problem. It followed the Federal law which since 1790 has made all the yellow and brown races ineligible to citizenship because of unassimilability and the menace they would offer if established here. Certainly if immigration is to be restricted, we should commence with that element which is barred from citizenship.

Of course, Japan protested against such legislation on the grounds of discrimination and she was the only nation which did protest. The measure is not discriminatory against Japan, for it applies to half the population of the globe, and the Japanese constitute not more than 7 or 8 percent of those affected. It should be remembered, too, that Japan in protection of her own people, wisely excludes Chinese and Koreans, thus discriminating against people of her own color.

Some of the American spokesmen for Japan were very active in insisting that Japan has been insulted or offended by the passage of the ineligible-to-citizenship clause in the immigration law of 1924. Until Pearl Harbor, they kept up a constant agitation for the repeal or at least a modification of this clause.

Now it is seriously, and with equal vigor, contended that a partial repeal of our Asiatic exclusion laws would be a contribution to the war effort.

Was there ever a more fallacious argument?

Having placed all Asiatic peoples on an equal basis with respect to immigration and naturalization, Congress is now about to pass a bill discriminating in favor of one Asiatic nation as against all other peoples of the Orient who were excluded because of ineligibility to citizenship.

The proponents of this discriminatory legislation contend that it is merely a friendly gesture toward a brave Ally in the present war. But China is not our only Ally subject to our exclusion laws. What about our brave Allies the Filipinos, and what about all the potential Allies in the Orient, the natives of India, Burma, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and others?

Is not this proposed legislation a deliberate slap in the face for all Asiatic peoples, except only the Chinese?

Is it not a complete reversal of America's carefully considered, nondiscriminatory immigration policy toward all nations and races of Asia?

It has been stated that Congress, in the adoption of various Asiatic exclusion laws, has never referred to any specific class of persons by race, except the Chinese.

This is true, and if it removes any implied stigma upon the Chinese people to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, as amended, or any supplementary exclusion legislation specifically mentioning the Chinese, there can be no valid objection, since other laws, more general in character and nondiscriminatory as between races and peoples of Asia, fully meet the object sought by the original Chinese Exclusion Act.

Such, however, is not the purpose of the pending bill. To the contrary, the enactment of this bill will place upon our statute

books an immigration policy frankly and clearly discriminatory against a far greater number of Asiatics than the Chinese.

THE STORY OF LEGISLATION ON ORIENTAL LABOR

The legislation on oriental labor sprang from the people. The centers of anti-Chinese agitation have always been found at the points of the greatest contact between the two types of labor, hence the laws on the subject have not been of the type which far-seeing statesmen first suggest, and whose support is largely a matter of the education of public opinion. They (the laws) were the product of the actual experiences—sometimes of the race prejudices—of those in the humblest ranks of society. For 30 years the working people persistently made known their needs, winning at last a practically unanimous support in the State, so that all classes united to urge the tardy Federal legislation for exclusion. The largely instinctive judgment of the working people of California, which has refused to sanction this admixture of races, has been accepted as the policy of the Nation. This origin of the anti-Chinese legislation is shown in the relationship which the different groups of laws bear to each other. The regulations made in the miners' meetings are repeated in the State laws and even in the Federal statutes; the demands of the labor unions are reflected in city ordinances, and these in turn suggested measures passed by the State legislature; while the futile attempts at State exclusion furnished the models for Federal laws regulating immigration.

The legislation upon the subject of oriental labor has been rendered intricate by the triple jurisdiction resulting from our peculiar form of government. Police measures, the control of licenses, and of many other conditions of labor, are largely exercised by the local governing bodies of towns or cities. The State has paramount jurisdiction on the same subjects, and attempted to exercise the right to exclude altogether, or to tax heavily, the importation of undesirable immigrants. But here it came into conflict with the Federal Government, which, by virtue of its treaty-making powers and control of commerce has the right to regulate immigration.¹ The United States Supreme Court in a series of decisions has refused to recognize any State legislation encroaching on these powers. Thus the final action on this question, which was of the most vital importance in the social and economic development of California, was left to the representatives of States where no such problems had ever been met, and where there was a more or less complete ignorance of their significance.

In studying the great mass of legislation by which these law-making bodies have attempted to deal with the problems of oriental labor, we find that the measures fall naturally into four groups:

First, the ordinances or orders of local authorities.

Second, State laws which aimed to discourage immigration by special taxation or the curtailment of political and civil rights.

Third, the attempts of the State to discourage or diminish immigration.

Fourth, Federal legislation regulating immigration.

In studying these four groups of measures, we will find three well-marked periods of development:

First, the period prior to 1867, when the opposition to the Chinese was not well organized.

Second, the strong, well-organized, anti-Chinese movements of the later sixties and the seventies, culminating in the radical provisions of the new constitution of the State, and the Federal exclusion law of 1882.

Third, the period since the enactment of the exclusion law.

LOCAL REGULATION OF CHINESE LABOR, 1852-67

It is difficult to trace the history of the local regulations affecting the Chinese, or to estimate correctly the influence of those measures of which it is possible to find the record. Many of the State laws merely gave authority for local enactments, and these measures were of a character not usually enforced with any degree of uniformity.² Often the most significant and effective action was extralegal. For example, there are communities where by the unanimous consent of the public, the Chinese, without sanction of law, have been effectually excluded for years.

As has been pointed out, the opposition to the Chinese developed first in the mining regions, and it is here that the legislation against them began. It is impossible to learn much of the details of these regulations of the miners. There seems to have been no uniformity in the rules governing the different districts, and we have but scanty records of the miners' meetings. We do not know what part of the status of the Chinese was determined by definite enactment, and what part by common consent. They appear to have worked only the less profitable claims, and to have acquired title by purchase from the whites, or to have leased the right to work from white owners. They worked in companies under Chinese masters. White men sometimes employed them, but it was claimed that the latter always had to pay a higher rate of wages.³

It is evident that they were never permitted to work in some of the mining districts and that others passed laws expelling them. Bothwick, who visited several mining camps, says, "In some parts of the mines, however, the miners had their own ideas on the subject, and would not allow the Chinese to come among them; but generally they were not interfered with as they contented themselves with working such poor diggings as it was not thought worth while to take from them."⁴ We have found a few newspaper reports of the acts of miners' meetings excluding the Chinese. In 1858, the Agua Fria District, Mariposa County, passed a resolution to the effect that "the regulations which have been in vogue for 2½ years prohibiting Chinese from working within our district shall be the law and rule of this district. Any Chinaman who tries to mine must leave on 24 hours' notice, otherwise the miners will inflict such punishment as they deem proper."⁵ The Gold Hill and Placerville miners in Eldorado County passed resolutions in 1858 and 1859 to prevent the Gold Hill Canal Co. from acquiring claims for the purpose of speculation by selling them to Chinamen.⁶ At a mass meeting of the Gold Hill miners in 1858, resolutions were passed expelling the Chinese from Diamond Springs Township. It was provided, however, that those who had purchased claims should be allowed to work them out before leaving.⁷ The miners of Colville passed a law in 1862

²The law requiring a certain number of cubic feet of air to each person in sleeping apartments is an example of this. Also laws permitting the removal of Chinese houses of prostitution, or even at a later time, the removal of the Chinese quarters. The school regulations are also examples of local regulations authorized by State law.

³Bothwick, J. D., *Three Years in California*, ch. xvii. Edinburgh and London, 1858.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 262.

⁵Bulletin, November 24, 1858.

⁶Historical Souvenir of Eldorado County, Calif., etc., Oakland, 1883, p. 102.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 102.

excluding Chinese from the mines.⁸ The miners of the Buckeye Mining District held a meeting in 1867 to discuss the admission of Chinese to their district. They had never before been admitted and it was decided to continue the exclusion.⁹ These examples are sufficient to establish the possibility of local action of this kind. When we consider the strong feeling against the Chinese, and the failure to obtain relief from State laws, we have every reason to believe that there were many other districts with similar local regulations.

By the authority of an act of the legislature, approved December 21, 1877, the people of the State were called upon to express themselves upon the subject of Chinese exclusion in the election of September 3, 1879. The results of this vote indicate a very remarkable unanimity of opinion throughout the State; of the 161,405 votes cast, 154,638 were opposed to the admission of the Chinese, and 833 favored it, 5,884 failing to vote on the question. In his message transmitting the results of the election, Governor Irwin laid great emphasis on the significance of this popular verdict. He declared that there was no reason to discount the result as an expression of the wishes of the people of the State, as the vote was by secret ballot at a time when there was no undue excitement. He claimed that the decision could not be attributed to ignorance or prejudice, as fully two-thirds of the voters of the State were natives of the United States, the majority of them from Northern and Western States. They were men not inclined to race prejudice, who by education and association had been well grounded in the principles of our free institutions and who fully appreciated the sacredness of individual liberty.

A year later a similar vote was taken in Nevada with the results: Total vote cast, 18,397; for the admission of the Chinese, 183; against it, 17,200; not voting 955. Even when one makes allowance for the influence of any peculiarities in the printing of the ballots, the results of these elections indicate a remarkable uniformity of public opinion. Those favoring the admission of the Chinese or failing to vote might easily have been persons whose economic welfare depended on a supply of cheap Asiatic labor. There can be no question that the great majority of the citizens of those States were thoroughly convinced that men of this race were unfitted for membership in an American commonwealth.

CONTINUED EFFORTS OF THE LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO SECURE CHINESE EXCLUSION

During the eighties the efforts to solve the Chinese problem were transferred from the State to the National legislative bodies, but the workingmen's organizations of the Pacific coast were still back of the whole movement. They never relaxed their strenuous efforts to enlist the active support of fellow-trade-unionists in the East, or ceased to make known their grim determination to prevent the continued influx of oriental labor, even if by a last resort to violence. They ignored all party lines and voted steadily and consistently with a view to the promotion of this one issue. The special anti-Chinese leagues were continued, and all new organizations of workingmen recognized this as one of their chief aims. Special conventions for the consideration of the subject of Chinese exclusion were held in 1882 and 1885, as well as at subsequent periods when the renewal of the legislation on the subject was

⁸Bulletin, December 2, 1862.

⁹*Ibid.*, September 11, 1867. (A History of California Labor Legislation—California University Economics—Berkeley, 1910, by Lucile Eaves, pp. 115, 116, 117, 118, 119.)

¹Passenger Cases, *Smith v. Turner*, 7 Howard 282.

under discussion. The more detailed accounts of the actions of these conventions will be given in connection with the history of the Federal anti-Chinese legislation.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION OF 1876

We have seen that between 1870 and 1880 there was a great and, to the Californians, a most alarming increase in the number of Chinese arriving at San Francisco, and that during this period the people of California, particularly the workmen of San Francisco, were engaged in a continuous anti-Chinese campaign, which broke out at intervals in great popular demonstrations. We remember that the year 1876 was the one marked by the greatest influx of Chinese and by a correspondingly vigorous demonstration. The California Representatives in Washington faithfully reflected the feelings and made known the demands of their constituents. In February 1876, Senator Booth presented the resolutions of the California Legislature calling for a modification of the Burlingame Treaty.¹⁰ Sargent¹¹ in the Senate, and Page¹² in the House promptly brought in concurrent resolutions requesting the President to open negotiations with the Chinese Government for the purpose of securing such changes in the treaty as would permit a restriction of immigration. The resolutions were passed; but the President failed to act in the matter. Committees were appointed in the Senate¹³ and House to investigate the character and extent of the objectionable immigration, and, at the suggestion of Senator Sargent, it was agreed that they should act as a joint committee.¹⁴ This committee began taking testimony in San Francisco in the following October, and in February 1877 brought in a voluminous report of over 12,000 pages.¹⁵

As a result of this investigation a majority of the committee brought in a recommendation to the effect that, "Measures be taken by the Executive looking toward a modification of the existing treaty with China, confining it to strictly commercial purposes; and that Congress legislate to restrain the great influx of Asiatics to this country. It is not believed that either of these measures would be looked upon with disfavor by the Chinese Government. Whether this is so or not, a duty is owed to the Pacific States and Territories, which are suffering under a terrible scourge, but are patiently waiting for relief from Congress." The committee said that violence could be restrained so long as there was a reasonable hope that Congress would apply a remedy, but declared that the safety of the State demanded that political power should not be placed in the hands of the Chinese, as they had no love for or appreciation of our institutions.¹⁶ The report states that, while the resources of the Pacific coast could be more quickly developed with the help of the Chinese, whose labor was profitable for the capitalist classes, the laboring men and artisans were, without exception, opposed to the further admission of the Chinese. The committee found many lawyers, doctors, merchants, divines, judges, and other intelligent citizens, who declared that the apparent prosperity derived from the presence of the Chinese was deceptive and

unwholesome, "ruinous to our laboring classes, promotive of caste, and dangerous to free institutions." Twenty operatives of different trades testified that the competition of the Chinese had reduced their wages to the starvation point. The facts that these hardships bore with especial weight on women wageworkers was emphasized.¹⁷

THE FIRST RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATION—THE 15 PASSENGER BILL

The report of the joint committee prepared the way for congressional action for a restriction of immigration, and the violent agitation against the Chinese by the Workingmen's Party of California¹⁸ made the need seem more urgent. A number of bills were brought in at the next session of Congress proposing varied plans for dealing with the question. In the House, Davis¹⁹ from San Francisco, and Luttrell²⁰ from Santa Rosa, considered it their duty as representatives of California interests to present bills restricting the immigration of the Chinese or preventing their employment and naturalization. The Nevada Representative had a bill ready,²¹ and Shelley from Alabama proposed a plan which not only prohibited further immigration,²² but undertook to transport and colonize the Chinese already here.²³ The California Senators also busied themselves with the Chinese legislation. Sargent presented a bill for the restriction of immigration,²⁴ but he and Booth devoted their efforts chiefly to procuring the passage of a concurrent resolution calling on the President to open correspondence with China and Great Britain²⁵ for the abrogation of the treaty provisions permitting unlimited immigration of the Chinese.

The House Committee on Education and Commerce sent in a prompt and unanimous endorsement of the resolution calling for the opening of correspondence for the purpose of securing a restriction of immigration. Willis, the chairman of this committee, was a Kentuckian who had a strong sympathy for the Californians in their efforts to solve the difficult race problem of the Pacific coast.

At the next session of Congress, the House, impatient with the long delay, showed a determination to take some action even though it meant the repudiation of the treaty with China. The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom the numerous resolutions, memorials, petitions, and bills on the Chinese had been referred, recommended a bill providing that no master of a vessel should be permitted to take aboard more than 15 Chinese passengers bound for a United States port. In presenting this bill the committee reviewed the previous efforts to secure restrictive legislation, referring to the numerous petitions urging such legislation, that the people of the Pacific coast had sent to Congress since 1868, and calling attention to the fact that the President had twice been presented with joint resolutions urging him to seek a modification of the treaty. The committee discussed the question of the power of Congress to pass laws which would supersede a treaty, maintaining that, "To refuse to execute a treaty for reasons which approve themselves to the conscientious judgment of a nation is a matter of the

utmost gravity, but the power to do so is a prerogative of which no nation can be deprived without deeply affecting its independence."²⁶

Willis, the chairman of the committee recommending the bill, was one of the ablest advocates of the measure on the floor of the House. In his speech in its support he states: "There are today in the hands of our committee the joint resolutions of four State legislatures, the memorial of the Constitutional Convention of California, passed only a few days ago without a single dissenting voice, together with the proceedings of innumerable societies, religious bodies, labor conventions, and the petitions of over 100,000 private citizens, setting forth from different standpoints the evils of Chinese immigration, and urging upon Congress the necessity for prompt and vigorous measures of relief."²⁷ The bill restricting the number of Chinese passengers passed the House on January 28, 1879, the vote standing, yeas 155, nays 72, not voting 61.²⁸

Judging by an extract quoted from a letter Senator Sargent, the rejoicing in San Francisco over the passage of this bill was quite hysterical in its intensity. His correspondent declared that men—strangers to each other—embraced upon the streets and wept for joy when they received the news.²⁹ But their joy was short-lived, for it was soon rumored that the President would veto the bill. Everything possible was done to prevent such action. The chambers of commerce of the coast cities,³⁰ and the constitutional convention sent telegrams urging the signature of the bill. The merchants of San Francisco closed their places of business so that their employees might swell the numbers of the great mass meetings held under the auspices of the city and State officials.³¹ The Pacific coast Representatives called on the President and his Cabinet with additional arguments and evidences of the urgent demands for the approval of the measure.

But no amount of pressure would induce President Hayes to sign the bill. In his veto message he said that while he recognized the right of Congress to terminate a treaty, such a denunciation was justified only by a great necessity. He also pointed out that the abrogation of a part of the treaty might invalidate the whole and thus leave American interests in China unprotected.³²

BITTER RESENTMENT OF THE VETO OF THE BILL

In the test vote of September 1879, only 224 of the 41,258 voters of San Francisco had voted in favor of the continued admission of the Chinese. The past history of the city furnished ample precedents for the execution of the will of the majority of the citizens by illegal or extralegal popular uprisings.

THE EXCLUSION LAW OF 1882

Miller in opening the Senate debate made a dignified and forceful argument in support of the bill, which he presented as the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He pointed out that the Government was already committed to such legislation, since a treaty had just been negotiated for the purpose of permitting it. In the

¹⁰ H. Rept. No. 62, 45th Cong., 3d sess., serial No. 1866.

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD VIII, 45th Cong., 3d sess., p. 769.

¹² Ibid., pp. 791-792, 793, 793-800.

¹³ Ibid., p. 4421.

¹⁴ Alta, February 26, 1879 (reprint of Sargent's speech).

¹⁵ Ibid., February 25.

¹⁶ San Francisco daily papers of February 27 and 28, 1879. The Alta publishes a list of 82 merchants who closed their places of business during the meetings.

¹⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 45th Cong., 3d sess., pp. 2275-2276.

¹⁸ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, IV, 44th Cong., 1st sess., p. 901.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 2850.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 3067, 3763.

²¹ Ibid., p. 4421.

²² Ibid., pp. 4678, 4705.

²³ 44th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 689 (published in a separate volume, serial No. 1734).

²⁴ Report of the joint committee, 44th Cong., 2d sess., No. 669, pp. v-viii, serial No. 1734.

²⁵ Report of the joint committee, etc., p. iv.

²⁶ See above, pp. 30, 150.

²⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VII, 45th Cong., 2d sess., p. 333.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 98, 271.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 318.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 68.

³¹ Ibid., p. 320.

³² Ibid., p. 81.

³³ This was necessary because the Chinese coming from Hong Kong were subjects of Great Britain.

last election both political parties and their candidates had pledged themselves to a restriction of Chinese immigration. He quoted the results of the test vote in California and Nevada to show how universal was the opposition to its continuance on the part of people best fitted to judge of its significance. He produced statistics showing the magnitude of the immigration, and its possible development in case this measure failed to pass. The conditions making it impossible for the two types of labor to compete were fully explained, and figures presented showing the encroachment of the Chinese in the industries of the Pacific coast. He declared that, "An irrepressible conflict is now upon us in full force, and those who do not see it in progress are not so wise as the men who saw the approach of that other 'irrepressible conflict' which shook the very foundations of American empire on this continent."

The other Senators from the region west of the Rocky Mountains were, of course, equally ardent in their support of the bill.

By this time the labor organizations all over the country were thoroughly enlisted. Petitions and memorials expressing the wishes of hundreds of thousands of workmen were presented from New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Alabama, Maryland, and California. As was frequently pointed out in the debates the bill marked a radical departure from the national policy which had hitherto welcomed the foreign immigrant of every country, but it is impossible to question the full endorsement of this legislation by the American people.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I also desire to call the attention of the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1882, at which time Senator Miller, of California, made a very comprehensive statement with respect to conditions then existing in California, the Western States, and in the United States, in connection with the question of immigration of orientals into the United States. The statement appears on page 1481 of volume 13, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My statement at this time is simply an act of courtesy to the senior Senator from California.

EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 132)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the July and August recess of the Senate I made use of the available time in a study, first-hand and on-the-ground, of relations and activities of the Government of the United States in Latin America. I desire to report to the Senate briefly on some of the things I found. The report will be filed later. It contains a tremendous amount of detailed information, and I think, due to the press of time today, I should request that there be no interruption during the short presentation I wish to make of this report.

First, however, I should like to express my appreciation for the facilities and courtesies extended to me by representatives of our American Government and of the governments of Latin American nations. I was graciously and hospitably received in every country visited. Every opportunity was afforded me to make unhampered inquiry into the problems

and conditions which concerned us. I found that many of the problems that concerned us, as citizens of the United States, were likewise giving great concern to the thoughtful citizens of these neighbor nations:

I should like to say, at once, that a single trip of the duration of mine makes no man an expert on Latin American affairs. I do not come before the Senate as an expert. There are a great many things which I did not find out. About some things, however, I have found out enough to arouse in me something more than mere partisan curiosity to find out more. I intend to pursue those matters further.

If I missed some things, there are other things in regard to our activities in Latin America which no honest traveler could possibly miss.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and the chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the Defense Program—the Truman committee—which I carried with me on the trip.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 2, 1943.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States nonessential spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee. The same applies to your aide, Mr. Maurice Mumford.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 2, 1943.

Hon. HUGH A. BUTLER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States defense spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of great value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A4163, there appears a copy of a speech I made on the food situation in South America; and also in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, at page A5073, appears a copy of an article published in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, which I wrote on the subject Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America. Senators may desire to review those articles in connection with my remarks and the report I am filing today.

When making plans for this trip, I was approached by Chairman BYRD, of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and also by Chairman TRUMAN, of the Special Committee to Investigate the national defense program, suggesting that I be on the lookout for such information as might be useful to them in their respective positions on these committees. Each of these chairmen clothed me with authority to represent their committees, as per copies of the letters which I have requested to have made a part of my remarks.

In order to be as well prepared as possible to carry out these requests, I gathered in advance and organized as much statistical information as possible with reference to our programs and financial obligations in the 20 countries to be visited. This material added considerably to the weight of the baggage we took along, and the inspectors at Miami, where we arrived on our first night en route, were most curious about the whole assortment of figures, data, and so forth. We were advised along about 9 o'clock, following our arrival in Miami, that the Government customs inspectors would have to go through our baggage and inspect everything, before our departure the next morning. We were told how two specialists from some Detroit factory, going by air on an emergency call to the airfields in England, only a short time before, had been delayed while United States inspectors went through their baggage, and the men finally had to go to England without the blue prints they required for the work they were to do when they reached England. The blueprints arrived weeks later in England. In the meantime duplicates had been mailed direct to them in England from the Detroit factory. Not wanting to proceed south without our files, I called my secretary, toward midnight, asking him to attempt to contact Secretary Hull in person. Secretary Hull had been most cooperative in assisting me in all my plans. Mr. Hull was not at home until later, but he called the secretary and when he heard of the situation he called Secretary Morgenthau; and by morning the customs inspectors were told to pass our baggage without inspection.

There are more than 175 typewritten pages in the report I am filing. As I just stated, much of the information was gathered before my departure. During the trip and since my return there have been many additions to the reports. Besides the material I am handing to the committees, I have several times the amount yet in my files. It would be miraculous if all errors were avoided in making such a long and detailed report, especially as regards the figures

covering actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit, totaling more than \$6,000,000,000.

As I proceed with my short report, I should like to call to the attention of Senators, simply in order to give them an indication of what the report contains, a few words on budget comparisons. I read a short paragraph from the report:

In per capita terms, a great difference exists between the Latin-American nations and the United States. For instance, the total of the budgets of all 20 Latin American countries was \$1,067,000,000, in 1941. This is roughly \$8.45 per capita for the 120,000,000 people of these 20 countries. The United States Budget in 1941 was \$60,000,000,000, this being roughly around \$461, per capita.

The 1942 budget for these Latin American countries totals roughly only \$1,500,000,000, or \$12.50 per capita. In the United States the 1942 Budget was \$100,000,000,000, or roughly \$769 per capita.

It had been my intention to go into some detail, in making the report to the Senate, in connection with the details of the trip, the itinerary, and so forth. However, due to the press of business before the Senate, and to the fact that other Senators desire to obtain the floor today, I shall omit very much of that part of what I had intended to say. Nevertheless, I should like to outline very briefly the route we took. We proceeded from Miami to Cuba, from Cuba through Yucatan, all the way by air, of course. From there we went to Mexico City; from Mexico City south to the Central-American countries, down the west coast of South America as far as Santiago, across the Andes, and through Argentina. Then we visited Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, the Guineas, and came on home, through the Caribbean, where we made several stops—at Trinidad, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and the Haitian Republic. There are many interesting things which I should like to tell the Senate sometime, when we have more time for such a recitation.

I should like to speak of the courteous treatment I received from the American Ambassadors. My visit to the 20 foreign countries, where I contacted representatives of the United States—the Ambassadors in many cases, and their principal staff personnel in other cases—leads me to comment that I deem it a very wise plan for us to select successful businessmen as our Ambassadors when that is possible. I think we may be inclined to appoint too many career men as our Ambassadors—men worthy and competent in every way except for their lack of business experience. Our contacts with foreign countries are largely business contacts. An Ambassador versed in protocol but lacking business acumen can stand in the way of great steps in inter-country progress and development.

Generally speaking, I was very favorably impressed with the men and women who staff our embassy offices in Central America and South America; but they are underpaid. We have raised to the rank of Ambassadors all those who represent the United States in the territories I have visited; but we have left the pay at the same base of that which they received as consular representatives.

Any criticism I may appear to have directed toward the waste and extravagance in Central America and South America does not apply to our State Department. On the other hand, I should be inclined to criticize that Department for its policy of keeping expenses at too low a minimum. I was most sympathetic with the staff members of our embassies, who were plainly hampered due to the lack of funds, when all around we were following the extreme reverse policy in every other program. We can well afford to adopt a more liberal policy toward the salaries and expenses of those who represent this country abroad.

One Ambassador made what I thought was a very splendid and practical suggestion as to the desirability of having our Ambassadors spend more time in the United States. His suggestion was that at least every so often, perhaps every 3 years, the Ambassador and his principal assistant should be required to spend approximately an equal amount of time in the home country, principally through the agricultural areas where men and women really have to work for what they get. I am quoting the words of the American Ambassador to one of the countries to the south of us.

I was very favorably impressed with the high quality of the work being done by American business representatives. American firms doing business in Latin America are among our best ambassadors of good will. They build hospitals and schools on their own. They attempt to get a balanced diet for the people, through their own efforts.

One of the common questions which was asked me at each of the stops I made in the 20 countries—and in some countries we made 3 or 4 stops—was, "Senator, how does it happen that you are making this trip? We looked you up in the Directory, and we noticed you are a member of the minority party." That fact rather surprised them.

I then proceeded to try to convince them that the majority party—regardless of which one of our parties happens to be in the majority—is not the only one interested in friendly relations with our neighbors. I went on to explain that President Hoover had made a trip to South America, that under his administration the phrase "good neighbor" was adopted, that our policy on that basis has been continued, and that it should be continued during whatever administration may have control in the United States.

I went on to speak of Dwight Morrow, who is acknowledged in all the countries I visited as the outstanding Ambassador who has represented the United States in any Latin American country during recent times. Of course, he accomplished a great deal of good. I then also called their attention to the fact that on the patent side of their weekly papers—this occurred in Colombia—there was a picture of James G. Blaine, one-time Secretary of State of the United States, and an article about him. He is in a way their Thomas Jefferson, because they look upon him as the originator of the Pan American

Union. I spoke of all this for the purpose of showing them that the members of both political parties in the United States, just as the members of different parties in their own countries, are keenly interested in maintaining friendly relations.

As I said a moment ago, I undoubtedly missed many interesting facts in connection with our activities in Latin America, but I should like to list several facts plainly apparent to any honest observer.

One cannot miss the fact, in the first place, that our policy toward Latin America, which began as good neighborism, has, in these days of the New Deal reign, ceased to be good neighborism. It has become "rich uncleism." Beneficence is, perhaps, a quality of old age. But the beneficence in this case surpasses anything known in the long history of hand-outs. The instrumentality of our so-called good-neighbor policy is not, as we are often and feelingly told, good will. The instrumentality of the United States' so-called good-neighbor policy is the United States Treasury. We are not winning the friendly collaboration of the peoples of Latin America. We are trying to buy it.

That is the first fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America.

The second fact is like unto it. Our beneficence in Latin America is not beneficent. It is profligacy, and the long-term results of profligacy are sure to be disastrous. Our wastefulness is already inviting disaster from two directions.

First. First of all, American money in Latin America is fastening projects on the nations of Latin America which Latin American money could not support and which, in many instances, it would not support if it could. However much we may dislike it and whatever further gigantic sums it may cost us, we have the bear by the tail. Having provided those countries with many institutions and enterprises which, apparently, they do not seriously want, we are committed as a nation to keep them going.

Second. In the second place our wastefulness in Latin America has thrown the economy of those countries out of joint and put them on the crest of the wave of prosperity. In the United States, during the New Deal's early days we used to hear a good deal about spending our way into prosperity. This, I believe, is the first time in the history of financial irresponsibility when one nation has undertaken to spend another nation into prosperity—and not one other nation, merely, but 20 of them.

Our hold on the bear's tail thus is tightened. If we keep on spending we shall continue to be hated down there—as we are hated already—for upsetting their economy. If we stop spending, we shall be hated even worse because we made their boom collapse.

That is the second fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America.

The third fact is that in these projects in Latin America we are doing, for 20 countries, exactly what the common-sense of the American people has refused

to allow to be continued here at home. A trip through Latin America these days is like nothing quite so much as a trip through the United States in the Hopkins-Tugwell heyday of the New Deal. Under one guise or another, we have all the New Deal's repudiated agencies—the W. P. A., the P. W. A., the N. Y. A., the F. S. A., the C. C. C.—all the way up or down the line. In country after country we go from boondoggle to boondoggle. Now having, after their fashion, made over the United States, the New Deal's experimenters have rolled up their sleeves to make over Latin America. The collectivism which we have turned down here in the United States has been wrapped up in United States currency and is being foisted upon Latin America. When the awakening comes, the people of those nations are likely to have about the same regard for the United States as the people of the United States have come to have for the New Deal.

No honest American traveler can fail to find out that fact in Latin America.

The fourth thing which we find out is that the thoughtful people of Latin America do not like what we are doing any better than the American people, if they knew, would like it. Latin Americans are not suppliants. Neither are they paupers. They do not want hand-outs. They want to make their own way. They can make it. What they want from us is not to be led by the hand, as we would lead a child. It is not to be fed from a silver spoon. What they want from us is our cooperation, not in doing things our way, but in doing things their way. They want our leadership and example, not in what we can do for them, but as to how we have been able to do so well by ourselves.

Everywhere I went, I found that the men who take the long look in those countries are alarmed at our attitudes and policies. This alarm can readily degenerate into hate. That is what, inevitably, will happen unless at once we initiate a policy which treats the people of those countries neither as mendicants nor as children, but as adults, capable of making a good future with what they have and by their own efforts.

There is a fifth fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America. It is that the people of the United States have not been told—they have not even had it hinted at—what is actually going on there. The keynote of the New Deal's bookkeeping in Latin America is deception. Congress is deceived as to how much should be appropriated. The country is deceived in regard to the way it is spent. The peoples of Latin America are deceived into believing that the spending can go on forever.

Some very intelligent persons have been taken in by these deceptions. Some members of each of our major parties have been taken in by them. I am even ready to believe that some of the Government's own administrators of Latin-American affairs have been taken in by them.

But the fact remains that no clear picture of what we are spending in Latin

America has ever been drawn by this administration. Every obstacle is thrown into the path of a Senator who, like myself, tries to get the materials for such a picture. No comprehensive and honest statement has ever been made, capable of being understood, as to what this spending is specifically and actually for. In short, what we have here is one of the most serious instances in the history of our Government of plain and gigantic misrepresentation.

These are some of the things I found out in Latin America. The specific data to illustrate and support these general conclusions are unbelievably voluminous. Some of them, however, I should like to call to the immediate attention of the Senate through the report I am today filing with the Truman committee. There will be more to follow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, about which I have spoken, be ordered printed as a Senate document and referred to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, at whose request this investigation was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Just a moment. A while ago I spoke of the friendly attitude of the people everywhere I went. I was treated with the greatest of courtesy; and I prize, more highly, perhaps, than any other single document I have following the trip, an appreciative letter from our Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, following a very brief statement which I was asked to make to the Senate of Chile. With the permission of the Senate, I should like to read that statement into the RECORD. It consists of less than two pages. It is addressed to the president and members of the Chilean Senate, and is as follows:

Mr. President, Honorable Members of the Senate, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to address you. From what I have read and observed, I am convinced that the Senate of Chile is one of the great factors for good and for human progress among the governments of the Western Hemisphere. I, therefore, count it a great privilege to appear before this august body.

I was also unexpectedly honored by being granted a personal interview with your distinguished President, Senor Rios, whose graciousness to me as a common citizen of the United States of America added to the warmth in my heart for the splendid people of Chile.

I am visiting each of the twenty republics of Central and South America, pioneering a trail of better understanding through personal visits which I hope many of my colleagues in the United States Senate will follow.

My parents were pioneers on the prairies of Nebraska. They helped in the building of a great Nation. I am pioneering, myself, to help the building of a genuine hemispheric understanding. I hope more of my people can visit your beautiful, bountiful, and wonderful country, and also that more of your people can visit us in the United States.

No other continents of the world, extending from pole to pole, peopled with citizens whose objectives and programs are so much in harmony, whose religions look to the same God, have such a great opportunity as these

of this hemisphere. Together we are a tremendous power for peace in the world.

The people of the United States have a deep and genuine desire to always be friends of the people of Chile; to visit in your country; to work with you toward world peace; to trade with you; to be looked upon as friends. This attitude of the people means that our good relations will continue to bear fruit, no matter who sits in the administrative chair in either Chile or the United States, or what political party is elected to administer the affairs of government.

As Senators, you here, as we in the United States, are servants of all the people and not of any one group alone. This you have well demonstrated in your sensible labor legislation which requires a high degree of accountability from both labor's leadership and the employer.

The people of Chile have benefited in numerous other ways from the progressive legislation enacted by this body.

The people of the United States are eager to continue as friends with the people of Chile and of all other governments in the world. We, as a people, have no imperialistic desires. We, as a people, want only peace and fair trade and friendship, and I am sure your objectives are the same.

Only a few days ago a distinguished Member of this body, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] addressed a meeting of the National Grange in Michigan. I do not have his permission to insert his statement in the RECORD, but it fits so well with the thought which I carried in every contact I made in South America, and the thought I am trying to express here today, that I wish to read from it. The junior Senator from Vermont said:

Whether we want it or not, most of the nations of the earth look to America for leadership today. We will accept that leadership and pray that we may use it wisely. It must not carry with it, however, any pledge to support the rest of the world. We should not promise that which we cannot do. We can only help the other people to help themselves. We will not do this by scattering American resources in careless abandonment. Above all, let us promise ourselves that while we will assume leadership, it will be leadership and not domination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has said that we have spent \$6,000,000,000 in South America, virtually in buying those countries.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know how much has been spent in buying critical war materials down there, based on any of the figures which he has?

Mr. BUTLER. I would say in answer to the Senator from Tennessee that the report which I have is not paged, but I can assure him that it includes the details of that item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator recall—

Mr. BUTLER. Allow me to explain further, please. The report also states that in no one place have we actually spent \$6,000,000,000. There have been expenditures; there have been allotments, and credits have been extended in an amount much greater than \$8,000,000,000, and that statement is included in

the report. But I base my article on the \$6,000,000,000 rather than the \$8,000,000,000 plus.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator not state, if he has made an examination, that \$1,004,000,000 of the total amount was expended in the purchase of critical materials needed by the United States in the war? Is that not true?

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, I will make an additional statement which no doubt should have been in my statement to the Senate. In the list there are many items in connection with the purchase of critical materials which I would not criticize. The statement contains the information that where certain materials are selling, for example, at a unit cost of about 70 cents in Central or South America, we are now paying a price of about seven or eight dollars per unit here, so the billion or more which the Senator has mentioned covers, in my opinion, a tremendous amount of waste.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question. He says that \$6,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000 has been appropriated for use down there. Is it not true that the Senator, within the last 2 days, has written the department to ascertain how much has been spent? Is that not true?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I will state to the Senator that after I received the assignment from the two committees mentioned—

Mr. MCKELLAR. Did the Senator receive an assignment from two committees to make the investigation, or did he make it on his own authority?

Mr. BUTLER. I will read the letter to which I referred, if the Senator wishes me to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, I should be glad to have it read.

Mr. BUTLER. The letter is addressed to me and signed by HARRY S. TRUMAN, chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States defense spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

The same kind of a letter was received from the Byrd committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Has the Senator made his individual report to the Truman committee and to the Byrd committee? I happen to be a member of the Byrd committee, and I have never seen the report.

Mr. BUTLER. Each of the committees has received a copy of the report.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator another question. He could have easily ascertained the facts by not

only asking the departments, but by coming to the Appropriations Committee, where I should have been happy to give him all the information which our committee has on the subject. From the reports which I have, the entire amount spent in South America is \$2,207,000,000, of which \$1,004,000,000 was for materials we received. In other words, nearly half the money was spent for critical war materials which we have received to be used in the war. Does the Senator dispute that statement?

Mr. BUTLER. Answering the Senator, and continuing the answer to the question which the Senator asked previously as to whether I had a compilation of the figures covering \$6,000,000,000; as I started to say, after receiving the letters I made it my business to obtain the figures from as many departments of the Government as I could, and get them tabulated, and that information is all in my report. It shows a total of over \$6,000,000,000. Since my return the letters to which the Senator referred, which I received from different departments of the Government of whom I made inquiry within the last few days, were in an attempt to bring my report somewhat up to date.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In this time of war, when we are on perfectly good terms with our South American neighbors, for the Senator to come here and say to the Senate that more than \$6,000,000,000 has been spent in South America, when he does not know what has been spent, and is now attempting to ascertain, does he not think that his statement is rather unfair and unjust?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, of course, the Senator has a right to his own opinion. I cleared my conscience, I will say to the Senator, by tabulating and proving every statement I have made.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course, we shall be glad to look into that. I shall do so. I went to the Senator today and told him that we had figures in the Appropriations Committee, and that the appropriations had been allowed after investigation. I told him that I should be glad to get the figures for him, and I asked him if he would not postpone his talk today until we could get the facts. I did not for a moment dream that the Senator wished to make a statement unless he was absolutely certain of its accuracy. I wish to assure him that I shall be glad to furnish him with every figure concerning the matter.

The Senator has already written an article on Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America, and I find in it that the Senator has made the statement that we have spent millions of dollars in Ecuador which we ought not to have spent. Does the Senator know that in dealing with Ecuador we had to establish bases on islands belonging to Ecuador in order to protect the Panama Canal from Japan, and that the bulk of that money was spent for that purpose? Did the Senator look into that matter?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe that the largest part of the military expenditures are included in the statements given to me. The reply usually made to

me was that the matter was secret information, and I did not ask that any figures of that nature be surrendered to me.

Mr. MCKELLAR. So the Senator does not know that through dealing with Ecuador we obtained security from Japanese invasion of the great Panama Canal?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator also knows that there is but one country in South America which has furnished a single soldier to the war.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Well, I do not know that even one country has done so. But let me answer the question the Senator has asked. I wish to say that with nearly all of the South and Central American nations to the south of us we were friendly. The Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, to whom the Senator has referred, went to South America a year or two ago, and made a great impression there. He is on the friendliest of terms with South American countries. We knew that the Japanese had great business interests in South American states; that Germany also had large interests there, that they did much trading there, as did Italy also. It seems to me that if our Nation under those circumstances was able by the good-neighbor policy to keep those countries friendly to us, we should have done so. We never have had a particle of trouble, and if we had had any trouble it would have cost us infinitely more than all the money that the Senator has referred to. It does seem to me that he should have gone to the officials of his own Government and obtained exact figures before making his statement.

Mr. BUTLER. They are all documented in my report, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Well, they may be documented, but I wish to look at the documents. I am very sorry, but I told the Senator I had heard of this only yesterday, and I am not prepared to answer all his statements. But in view of the fact that we have gotten along so well in our good-neighbor policy in South and Central America, and that we have been so successful in our policy under the most adverse circumstances, I do think that it is not fair or just, without first examining our own data, to bring in statements or statistics from other nations and submit them to the country at a time like the present.

If I understand correctly, \$2,207,000,000 is all that has been spent down there for every purpose, including the purchase of material, including the many things we have done down there for our own benefit, and got a return for it.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Certainly; the Senator can ask me anything he wishes.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I think he was quite enthusiastically in favor of a resolution adopted by his committee recently to investigate the lend-lease. Most of the loans to which I have been referring may

turn out to be a manipulation of the lend-lease. I am not saying that as a positive fact, but I think that if the Senator will do a thorough job in the Committee on Appropriations in the investigation not only of lend-lease, but of the other appropriations and transfer of funds from other departments, he will find some interesting facts. Let me say, further, that only a small percentage—I would not attempt to say how much, perhaps around one-third or one-fourth of the total sum, is in any way connected with defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that in the Committee on Appropriations every item of expenditure comes before the committee, and is given the most careful and painstaking attention. Recently, without regard to party, without regard to differences of opinion, the committee unanimously voted to employ a staff to go into all these matters, lend-lease and every other appropriation and that will be done. But instead of the Senator waiting to get a report from the committee which has the power and the right and the knowledge in the matter, he makes his statement here. First, he makes it in the Reader's Digest for December 1943 on "Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America," and then comes forward with a nearly 200-page report from a committee which does not exist. The Senator does not represent a committee. The Senator represents the Senator from Nebraska, and he has a perfect right to make a report to the Senate, in the way of a report or anything else, but it does not come from a committee of this body, and I say that, in my judgment, the Senator just let his imagination run away with him. He has not the facts, he has not the figures, and it seems to me the most inappropriate time in the world to make such a report, when we are getting along beautifully with our South American and Central American neighbors, which means so much to us. Why should we not continue the good-neighbor policy, which has been endorsed here? The people of Central and South America are great people. We are doing the right thing by them. We are cooperating with them; we are doing business with them; we are trying our best to work with them, and to help them, and at the same time have them help us in the great enterprise in which we are engaged.

I recall the Senator stated a while ago that he was told by representatives of nations down there that they did not like receiving money from the United States for any purpose. That was the substance of the statement. If that is true, is the Senator's statement authenticated by any officials of any of those governments? I am sure the Senator has not a president or a secretary of the treasury or a secretary of any other department of any of those nations who will vouch for the statement that they do not want anything from America, because they have made applications for these things and we have granted them, where the purposes were proper and right and when we got value received for the money.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—
Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I have the greatest respect for the Senator, and he is entitled to his opinion, just as I am to mine; but I have stated several times that the statements I have made are based on what were purported to be facts received from departments of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. What government?

Mr. BUTLER. Our Government. Let me say further that we are doing everything we possibly can to avoid inflation in this country, and we all know what the administration is now doing to defeat the antisubsidy bill. But let me just quote from one page:

"Labor wage rates in Latin American nations compared to the United States:

"In the Dominican Republic the average labor wage is 70 cents. The United States project rate in the Dominican Republic"—and there are several projects—"is \$3 to \$5. In Cuba the rate is \$1.25. Ours is \$4 to \$6. In Paraguay the rate is 60 cents. On United States projects in that country the rate is \$3 to \$5. In Brazil the rate is \$1.30. Our rates in that country are \$5 to \$10. In Bolivia the rate is 90 cents. Ours in that country is \$6 to \$8."

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many South American or Central American countries receive any lend-lease money at all?

Mr. BUTLER. Every one of them, to some extent. It is all covered in the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am informed that, quite to the contrary, probably only one or two of them receive any—Brazil, and one or two others.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe the Argentine receives any strictly lend-lease aid, but they have some projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Argentine or many of the others have received lend-lease money.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that the Argentine is considered in this country as one country that perhaps is unfriendly. I found it the exact contrary; and I did not visit one place, like Buenos Aires; I went to a dozen places. I went out to the ranches, and visited with the common people, as well as with those of the official classes, and, if I can judge anything at all, I will say that 90 percent of the people of Argentina are as friendly to the United States of America as are those of any other nation in South America, and we are doing less for them. It is not the money we spend that makes friends.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator cite one single official of any Central or South American country who made complaint against what was taking place between the United States and South America, any official? If so, what was his name? When the Senator was on this mission, his personal mission, looking after the facts—I do not question that—did anyone make the statement to the Senator that he did not believe in our arrangements?

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment. I am asking the Senator from Nebraska a question, whether there was any official who made the statement, and if so, to give his name.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Did any official of any South American or Central American government make any statement to the Senator to the effect that he disapproved the present arrangement; and if so, what was his name?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator must know that while I was touring South America I made every effort, representing myself personally, but being a Member of the Senate of the United States, to avoid any complications of that kind, and I did not return home to insult the good people of South America. I could answer the Senator, but I will do so privately, if he wishes, and I will give him the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has made an astounding statement, that \$6,000,000,000 has been spent in "boondoggling" in South and Central America, and I think he should not have any secrets about it. I think he should take us all into his confidence. Of course, I shall be glad to talk with the Senator at any time, because he and I enjoy the best of relations, but the Senator is appealing to the Senate to do something about this, and if he is, he should be willing to take the whole Senate into his confidence.

Mr. BUTLER. If the distinguished Senator will take time to read the 176 pages, he will have the information, and the answers to all the questions he has been putting.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly look into the 176 pages, and I intend to give all the facts as shown by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. I wish to say to the Senate that, as I think every Senator here knows, I am as much opposed as is any human being on earth to extravagant or wasteful or improper appropriations. I am spending the best years of my life trying to cut down appropriations. I am engaged in that undertaking almost at this very moment, because I was excused from the Committee on Appropriations to come to the Senate floor when I learned the Senator was not willing to let the matter go over until the time when I would know more about it, and when I could answer what I believed to be the mistaken assumptions of the Senator.

Later, Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to bring figures to the attention of every Senator in this body, and of the American public, and show just what the facts are, let the chips fall where they may, because I am not in favor of extravagant appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER. The figures have already been released.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that he proposes to bring in a later statement with reference to what the Committee on Appropriations has passed in the way of appropriations for the purposes covered by the Senator

from Nebraska, it seems to me a little inconsistent for us to have authorized that the report of the Senator from Nebraska be made a Senate document, because when the Senator from Tennessee makes his report, it might be appropriate to make that a Senate document, too, and the two Senate documents would be contradictory.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the statement of the Senator from Nebraska is entitled, under the rules of the Senate, to be called a Senate document, because it is an individual report. I made a trip abroad a few years ago, and when I returned I made a report, for my own use. I never brought it to the Senate, or attempted to have it reproduced as a Senate document, but I treated it as a private matter. I do not believe that under the rules what was submitted by the Senator should be treated as a Senate document, and if I may, I make the point of order against it being so denominated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I was ready to object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not presiding at the time, but he is advised by the parliamentarian that the Chair said "Without objection, it will be printed as a Senate document", and no objection was made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not as a Senate document. I was particular about listening for those words.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee is mistaken. The Senator from Nebraska did request that it be printed as a Senate document. At the moment I thought it was rather unusual that a Senator should ask that an individual report be printed as a Senate document, but I made no objection.

Mr. BUSHFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I feel that the Members of this body owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for the recent trip he made to 20 countries of Central America and South America, investigating the matters he has reported to this body.

In view of the fact that some objections and comments have been made by one of the Members of this body about his report, I think it only fair to the Senator from Nebraska to say to this body that he paid his own expenses on that lengthy trip, during which he discovered that some \$6,000,000,000 of American money had been dumped into South America and Central America.

TEXANS OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION AT SALERNO

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during the tragic days when our American forces were forcing an entrance at Salerno into the forbidden land of Hitler's European fortress, some of us Texans believed the brave boys of our own Texas National Guard Division, now the Thirty-sixth, were leading the way. On account of war regulations we could say nothing then.

Since then our belief has been proven a fact. Silence on our part is no longer necessary. The Washington Evening Star on Thanksgiving Day published an article by Associated Press war correspondent Relman Morin, in which he gave an account of the invasion and stated:

There is another star in the flag of Texas today.

We Texans, and, without doubt, all Americans, are proud of those Texas men and the brave men from other States who bitterly fought and won that victory, but the price in human lives and misery was great, and our hearts are sad.

Those brave Texas boys carried with them, as they stormed the shores amidst intensive gunfire, a copy of the reply Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis and his little band of 187 patriots in the Alamo in 1836 gave to Mexican Dictator Santa Ana and his 3,000 or more well-equipped soldiers when they demanded his surrender. That message was addressed:

To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world:

And read:

I shall never surrender or retreat. I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—victory or death.

Every one of those brave men died at his post of duty in the Alamo. Not one was left.

That type of undaunted bravery, as spoken and exemplified by Colonel Travis and his men, still goes marching on. That spirit makes our freedom and liberty secure.

Inasmuch as this news item which I have mentioned gives a splendid account of the invasion at Salerno, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Texans Are Revealed as Men Who Broke Defenses at Salerno," be printed in full at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXANS ARE REVEALED AS MEN WHO BROKE DEFENSES AT SALERNO (By Relman Morin)

WITH THE AMERICAN FIFTH ARMY IN ITALY, November 25.—There is another star in the flag of Texas today.

It was emblazoned there the morning of September 9 when the Fifth Army landed on the shores of Italy. The first troops to hit the beach that thunderous morning wore T patches on their shoulders. The letter T stood for Texas and the patch for the Thirty-sixth Division.

The Germans have come to know well the men of the Thirty-sixth.

The division was identified officially yesterday. Now the story of the Thirty-sixth can be told and nowhere in the military history of the United States is there a finer one.

It was an untried division—untried in the sense that it never had been in combat.

GIVEN SPECIAL TRAINING

Throughout the Army it was known as a "hot" outfit, however. It had distinguished itself time and time again in maneuvers.

As a result it had been given special training for amphibious operations. Originally it had been slated for a major role in the north African landing but through a change in plans it was held back for something bigger.

The Thirty-sixth was famous before it went into action. But it still was untried and there is no trial like battle.

It was given a key mission in the invasion of Italy. If you asked its officers why this green division was entrusted with so important an assignment they replied unblushingly, "Because it's a Texas division."

The division brought a Lone Star flag with it and carried it into battle. In the standard there is a parchment bearing a copy of Colonel Travis' last message from the Alamo. Every man in the division, including those not natives of Texas, can repeat it by heart.

LANDED AT SALERNO

The Thirty-sixth came ashore in the Gulf of Salerno at dawn September 9. The defenses of the beaches were well constructed and German troops were manning them. The surrender of Italy had been announced the night before. But days before the Sixteenth Panzer Division had moved into position on these particular beaches. They were ready and waiting.

The Thirty-sixth hit hard but it hit a strong wall. The first assault wave was pinned down by machine-gun fire. The second and third waded ashore through a hail of bullets and shells. It looked for a time as though none of the three waves would be able to breach the German shore defenses.

Finally the division broke through. For sheer courage in the face of withering fire, their attack at that moment rivals the greatest actions of American troops in any of our wars.

Their first objective was a railroad line about 1,000 yards from shore and once off the beach they roared straight across the fields through some marshlands until they reached it.

Then came the first of two critical moments in the establishment of the beach-head.

PASSES MACHINE GUNS

The Thirty-sixth swept right past and around a cluster of machine-guns and a few strong points which prudently remained silent during the charge of the first Texas elements.

The succeeding waves were caught in German fire when they tried to come up to the railroad. At the same time, German artillery in well-chosen sites in the hills a few miles back, again shelling the beach.

For perhaps a half hour, then, the battle hung in the balance.

At this moment the commanding general and his staff waded through the surf, crossed the beach and made their way through the hottest part of the action up to the railroad where the general took personal command of the action, his presence in the thick of the battle having an electric effect.

Two staff officers were in the Thirty-sixth in the last war. Lt. Col. Albert B. Crowther, San Antonio, Tex., was a sergeant then, and Lt. Col. William H. Martin, Houston, Tex., was a lieutenant.

They will tell you that the Gulf of Salerno that morning compared with the worst moments of the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

REPORT BY GENERAL EISENHOWER OF INCIDENT IN SICILY INVOLVING LT. GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs made request of Secretary of War Stimson for information and report concerning the General Patton affair. I have before me a letter received by me from the Secretary of War, and accompanying

that letter is the report received by the War Department from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. I ask that the letter and the report be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the letter and the report, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 25, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In sending you herewith the report requested by you on the incident involving Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., I wish to make clear certain basic principles which, from the beginning of the war, the War Department has followed because the Chief of Staff and I have considered adherence to them necessary to bring to our country, as quickly and with as little loss of life as possible, the ultimate victory in the great struggle being fought around the world.

In the first place, the greatest care was exercised in selecting the commanders of the distant theaters of war. The selected commander was then given the fullest authority to deal with all problems which might arise within his theater. Our principle in doing this was that the man on the ground knows the details of each such problem much better than we could know them in Washington. We then held—and hold—the theater commanders responsible for results.

Accordingly, General Eisenhower is responsible for all matters of discipline within his theater. I am, therefore, sending you his report with the full confidence of the War Department that his sense of justice and fairness has resulted in his acting in this matter, as in all others, in the highest interest of his soldiers and his country. The decision to weigh Lieutenant General Patton's great services to his country, in World War No. 1 and in World War No. 2, from these shores to Casablanca and through Tunisia to triumph in Sicily, on the one hand, against an indefensible act on the other, was General Eisenhower's. As his report shows, General Eisenhower, in making his decision also considered the value to our country of General Patton's aggressive, winning leadership in the bitter battles which are to come before final victory.

I am confident that you will agree with me that General Eisenhower's decision, under these difficult circumstances, was right and proper.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

During the Sicilian campaign General Patton was the mainspring of the effort during the sustained drive of the Seventh Army from Gela all the way to Messina. He absolutely refused to accept procrastination or any excuse for delay, with a resulting rapid advance of that Army which had much to do with the early collapse of resistance in Sicily. He drove himself as hard as he did the members of his Army throughout the campaign and consequently became almost ruthless in his demands upon individual men. While visiting wounded in hospitals in two instances he encountered unwounded patients who had been evacuated for what is commonly known as "battle anxiety," specifically nerve difficulty. Also, one man had a temperature. He momentarily lost his temper in these two instances, and in an unseemly and indefensible manner upbraided the individuals, and in one of the cases cuffed the individual involved so that the man's

helmet rolled off his head. These incidents were first reported officially to me by a medical officer, this report being followed by reports from three reputable newspapermen. Prior to receiving the report from the pressmen I took the following action:

First, to General Patton I wrote a letter advising him of the allegation, expressing my extreme displeasure, and informing him that any repetition would result in his instant relief. Further, I told him that he would necessarily make, on his own initiative to the individuals involved, amends, and, if necessary, take the necessary steps to make proper amends before his whole Army. I also told him that I would reserve decision affecting his relief from command of the Army until I could determine the effect of his own corrective action.

Second, the problem before me was whether the incidents as reported were sufficiently damaging to Patton and to his standing in his Army to compel me to relieve him, thus losing to the United Nations his unquestioned value as commander of an assault force, or whether less drastic measures would be appropriate. I sent General Lucas to make a complete investigation of the affair. I also sent another general officer to Sicily and made a short visit there myself for the purpose of determining whether or not any resentment existed in the Seventh Army against General Patton.

The following action was taken by Patton: He personally sought out the individuals involved and the persons who were present at the time the incidents took place. To these he made full apologies which it was reported to me were accepted. In addition, he visited each and every division in the Seventh Army and called together all officers to whom he registered his regret that he should have been guilty of any conduct which could be considered unfair or un-American. The officers of these divisions in turn relayed this message to the enlisted men. The measures taken by Patton were discussed by me with three newspapermen who have reported the incident, and apparently they were convinced that the measures taken were adequate in the circumstances. On top of all this I sent the theater inspector general to make a thorough inspection of the Seventh Army with the particular mission of determining whether or not there existed in that force any general resentment against Patton. The inspector general reported to me that, while there was more or less general knowledge that incidents of the character described had taken place, the men themselves felt that General Patton had done a splendid over-all job and no great harm had been done.

In this connection it must be remembered that, while the conduct of Patton in these specific cases was indefensible and resented by every officer who knew of it, Patton has in thousands of cases personally supported, encouraged, and sustained individuals. The net result was that throughout the Sicilian campaign the Seventh Army had a high morale. I personally supervised this investigation throughout and took those steps that seemed applicable in the circumstances because I believe that General Patton has a great field of usefulness in any assault where loyalty, drive, and gallantry on the part of the Army commander will be essential.

General Smith had a press conference yesterday with all of the representatives of the press and explained the essentials of the entire story as given above. This was done because of reports of the publication in the United States of exaggerated versions of the story. In this connection I commend the great body of American newspapermen in this theater because all of them knew something of the facts involved and some of them knew all including the corrective action taken and the circumstances that tended to ameliorate the obvious injustice of Patton's acts. These

men chose to regard the matter as one in which the high command acted for the best interests of the war effort and let the matter rest there. To them I am grateful.

Summing the matter up: It is true that General Patton was guilty of reprehensible conduct with respect to two enlisted men. They were both suffering from a nervous disorder and one man in the case had a temperature. Following an exhaustive investigation including a personal visit to Sicily I decided that the corrective action as described above was suitable in the circumstances and adequate. I still believe that this decision was sound. Finally it has been reported many times to me that in every recent public appearance of Patton before any crowd composed of his own soldiers he is greeted by thunderous applause.

GENERAL HERSHEY AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is the first opportunity I have had, either today or at any other time since I previously made a statement on the subject, to make a correction. During my statement on November 22, 1943, in connection with the conference report on Senate bill 763, I said in referring to General Hershey:

The Congress chose to place the execution of the law in the hands of a civilian agency, namely, the Selective Service System, with a director at its head, who came out of the body of civilians. Today he wears a uniform, but he is, indeed, a civilian; he was not chosen from the Army.

That statement clearly was meant by me to refer to General Hershey. As a matter of fact, the statement was accurate in respect of the representation it made that a civilian was first appointed as director, as I shall point out; but in respect of the real intentment which I conveyed, and which I think was understated, it was an error.

I received a telephone message from a friend to the effect that my statement was inaccurate, inasmuch as General Hershey is an officer of the Regular Army; and it is my desire at this time to rectify my statement.

In view of the close association Congress and particularly members of the Military Affairs Committees have had with General Hershey, and in view of his long participation in selective-service planning, commencing in 1936, 4 years prior to the enactment of the Selective Service Act, and thereafter extending up to the present time, and in view of his civilian background prior to entering the National Guard and becoming a member of the armed forces, I have come to consider General Hershey as having a civilian outlook, although technically he is an officer of the Regular Army.

General Hershey was commissioned as an officer in the Regular Army, following the World War. Prior to that time he was a civilian, engaging in civilian activities of various kinds, except for his participation as a member of the National Guard and his service with the National Guard on the Mexican border, and during World War No. 1. Among his civilian activities, General Hershey engaged in farming, teaching school, serving as principal of a high school, and as deputy sheriff.

During the time General Hershey has been an officer in the Regular Army, he spent 4 years as assistant professor of military science and tactics in the R. O. T. C. unit of Ohio State University, which assignment kept him in continual contact with students at the university and with civilians. Also during his tour of duty with the Regular Army, for almost 8 years—from 1936 up to the present time—General Hershey has been working on selective-service planning and operations, which activity has kept him in continual association with the civilian representatives of the Selective Service System, the Governors, and the civilian Reserve and National Guard officers with whom he worked on the joint Army and Navy selective service committee and in the Selective Service System.

As I was technically in error, I desire, of course, to correct that error, which is, to all intents and purposes immaterial, as I am attempting to show. The important factor which this statement gives me the opportunity to stress is that General Hershey, because of his civilian background and because of his long association, extending since 1936, with the civilian officers connected with selective service, has very definitely the civilian outlook. But in addition to that civilian outlook, by reason of his participation in military matters as an officer in the Army in the interim between his civilian activities and his assignment to selective-service matters, he also has the military outlook. Therefore, he is an ideal person to administer the Selective Service System under the direction of the President, inasmuch as that assignment requires selection, classification, and deferment not only to procure manpower for the military forces, but also to leave men in essential civilian activities in order to provide for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy and also to provide for the support and maintenance of the civilian population.

In order that my colleagues may have a brief but complete understanding of the background of the Selective Service System and of its predominantly civilian characteristics and personnel, together with General Hershey's long association with it, I present the following statement on that subject:

Under authority conferred by the National Defense Act, the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee was created in 1926 for the purpose of undertaking selective-service planning so that, in the event of an emergency, proposed legislation and rules and regulations would be available for procuring military manpower for the armed forces in an orderly, democratic, and selective basis, toward the end that sufficient numbers of men would be obtained for the armed forces, while at the same time making available by way of deferment sufficient numbers of men for war production and essential civilian activities.

It was recognized that in order to formulate the type of legislation and rules and regulations which would not only accomplish the above purpose but would accomplish it in such a manner as to

conform with our democratic processes, and be entirely acceptable to all of the people of this Nation, participation of, and advice from, civilians would be required. Consequently, in order to obtain this civilian advice and participation in the formulation of legislation and rules and regulations, and also in order to have personnel with a civilian outlook available to guide the administration of the legislation and rules and regulations in the event of an emergency, the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee was authorized to grant Reserve commissions in the Army and Navy to a limited number of specially chosen civilians from all parts of the country. Although lack of funds and the general attitude of the Nation during the period between 1926 and 1939 retarded progress, a number of civilians were commissioned, and commencing in 1935, in addition to correspondence courses, annual 2-week conferences were conducted by the members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee in four different sections of the Nation—namely, at San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, and Washington. Civilian Reserve officers who were carefully selected to work with the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee attended one of these conferences each year.

At these conferences all participants, including members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, were in civilian clothes, and the question of rank was entirely disregarded, inasmuch as the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee desired to have the civilian officers make criticisms and recommendations freely, toward the end that the most workable plans would be developed. As a result, the selective-service legislation and rules and regulations which were in effect during World War No. 1, and which had been partially revised by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, were entirely revised and streamlined on the basis of such criticisms and recommendations from those having the civilian outlook.

In 1935, when the civilians living west of the Mississippi were commissioned, a short statement was issued explaining the program. They read as follows:

For the past 10 years the War and Navy Departments have had a Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee busy preparing laws and regulations governing the obtaining of manpower in the time of war. They have perfected, with the assistance of a group of Reserve officers who administered the draft during the World War, a proposed law and a set of regulations to carry the law into effect. This has all been approved by the Secretaries of War and Navy. This Committee is now busily engaged in organizing a group of Reserve officers to receive training in the basic principles of selective service in order that they may administer the law in time of war. Authority has been granted for the recruiting of 85 officers in the Army and 10 in the Navy. This number is about one-half filled and partially trained. A study of the geographical location of this personnel indicates that there is scarcely no one located west of the Mississippi River. The War Department is anxious to secure 10 or 15 outstanding men in the far West to be commissioned in the Reserve.

The War Department's basic idea in securing this personnel is to take them when they are fairly young and over a period of years to train and inculcate them with the principles of selective service so that they can go out in an emergency and see that adequate manpower is obtained. One of this group will be placed in each State, to offer the Governor aid and guide him in the high-speed effort that must be put forth in obtaining manpower by the Selective Service System.

The War Department feels that this group should be about the age of 30, so that they can be commissioned as lieutenants and captains. Primarily they need men of recognized standing in the community. Some people have the idea that they should be lawyers. This is not necessary. This group will have to become very familiar with the selective-service law and regulations. This will be done by means of correspondence courses and assemblage for an annual training period of 14 days. This latter method cannot take place more than once every 2 years, due to lack of appropriations. Upon being ordered to active duty, they will receive the pay of the grade in which they are serving. Such orders are not issued without the consent of the officer in each case. In view of the distance, it is not contemplated to bring this personnel from the west coast to Washington, but to assemble them at some central point in the West, possibly San Francisco.

It was initially contemplated that the civilian Reserve officers would serve as a nucleus for the operation of the Selective Service System, serving as officials in national headquarters and also in each of the State headquarters. It subsequently developed, however, that additional personnel would be required for this purpose, both in number as well as from the standpoint of obtaining full and complete cooperation and participation by the respective States. Consequently, from 1936 to 1940, as a result of negotiations by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee with the adjutant generals of the respective States, full and complete cooperation and participation was obtained from the adjutant generals and the civilian National Guard officers attached to the respective State staffs.

These civilian National Guard officers attended the regional conferences in increasing numbers during that period and, under the direction and with the full cooperation of the adjutant generals of the respective States, were invaluable in furnishing full and complete cooperation from their States in the formulation of individual plans for each State, based upon the particular problems and circumstances existing in each State with which they were entirely familiar. Undoubtedly, all Members of the Senate are personally acquainted with the adjutant generals and their civilian National Guard staff officers in their respective States, whose assistance and participation have proved to be so valuable in the furthering of the war effort.

The national and State plans, together with the proposed legislation and rules and regulations, were reviewed and re-reviewed at every conference and in correspondence courses and special research studies between conferences, so that revisions were constantly made in

them as a result of criticisms, suggestions, and recommendations submitted by the civilian officers having an intimate knowledge of their respective localities and States and of the people residing there.

Also, at these conferences all in attendance rehearsed at each conference all of the operational functions set forth in the proposed legislation, the rules and regulations, and the plans. In this connection, those in attendance served in turn as officials of national headquarters, as field coordinators from national headquarters, as officials of State headquarters, as field coordinators from State headquarters, as members of local boards, as local board physicians, as Government appeal agents, as medical advisory boards, and as appeal boards. In such capacities they rehearsed time after time the actual operating functions of a prospective Selective Service System and, in doing so, used actual cases of World War No. 1 registrants, and not only coped with the innumerable problems and situations that were confronted by those in charge of manpower procurement in World War No. 1, the Civil War, and other wars, but also coped with the additional and new problems that were anticipated to be encountered under a current or future operation of such a system.

At these conferences they studied in detail the methods used in raising armies during the course of past wars, both in this country and elsewhere. They traced in detail the evolution of selective service from the earliest days, when no selection was required other than the physical ability to hold a spear, up through the ages, to and including World War No. 1, when much more careful selection was required in view of the changed methods of warfare and the vast essential production required to carry it on. From time to time in the course of these studies errors and mistakes in past operations and procurement methods were disclosed. They were to be meticulously avoided in plans for any possible future operations.

As a result of this specialized study and training, tempered by the completely civilian outlook of these Reserve officers, the proposed plans, legislation, rules and regulations were formulated on the basis that it would be imperative to maintain a proper balance between military manpower and essential production both for the military and for the civilian population, and that the selection and classification would have to be made on the most decentralized basis possible and in such a manner that the public generally, and those to be selected particularly, would accept the selection and classification without question as being fair, impartial, democratic, and the best manner of raising an army and navy, while at the same time providing for their support and maintenance as well as for the support and maintenance of the civilian economy and social structure. To accomplish this purpose, it was recognized that the selection and classification should be conducted by the civilian neighbors of the men who were to be selected and classified. On the other hand, it was

recognized that the civilian officers, both the Reserve officers and the State staff National Guard men, should participate in State headquarters under the Governors and in national headquarters under the President, but should confine their activities to advisory, educational, and guiding functions with respect to policies set forth in the plans, the legislation, and the rules and regulations, as modified from time to time.

In 1936, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey was assigned as executive officer of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, and in such capacity worked with the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee and the civilian National Guard and Reserve officers. He attended the annual regional conferences, and conducted other outside work in the form of special studies and correspondence courses assigned to these officers. His 4-year assignment on selective-service planning was scheduled to terminate in 1940, but in view of the world situation at that time, his orders relieving him of that assignment were canceled, and he was reordered to continue in his assignment as the executive officer of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, because of his familiarity with manpower procurement and the possibility, or even probability, that legislation would be enacted setting up a selective-service system which would require his full participation and maximum efforts, along with those of the civilian officers, in order to approach a successful administration, and also in order to carry out the program that had been so carefully and studiously prepared against just such a situation.

So, when the Burke-Wadsworth bill was introduced and when hearings on it were being held before the respective Committees on Military Affairs, Congress naturally looked to him as the source of information and advice with respect to the manner in which the legislation should be drafted and the manner in which such legislation ought to be administered and carried out. When this legislation was introduced, General Hershey began to call in some of the civilian officers to assist him in conferring with members of the executive branch of the Government and with Congress, and to have everything in readiness in the event the legislation was passed, so that the system could commence to function properly at the earliest possible moment.

Congress, in setting up the Selective Service Act, conferred almost full authority upon the President, but provided that there should be a Director of Selective Service, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and also provided that there should be civilian local boards and appeal boards. Additional provisions were inserted in the legislation in accordance with the plans and studies that had been made under General Hershey's supervision. Necessarily, it was impossible and impracticable to set forth all of the details of operation within the legislation, but General Hershey and his civilian officers, in answer to Congressional inquiries,

outlined in detail the substance of the contemplated rules and regulations and the exact manner in which they expected the act to be administered. The hearings and debates on this legislation are full and complete in that respect.

During the period from the introduction of the Burke-Wadsworth bill to the date of its enactment on September 16, 1940, and thereafter until October 1940, General Hershey and the other members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, together with the civilian officers who had come to active duty at his request, served as members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee or as officers attached thereto. On September 23, 1940, the President officially created the Selective Service System under the Selective Service Act; and on October 1, 1940, General Hershey was assigned to the Selective Service System; and the civilian officers were assigned on October 8, 1940, under the specific authority contained in section 10 (a) (3) of that act, which contemplated that General Hershey and such officers would, because of their thorough knowledge and complete training, necessarily participate in its administration.

The President appointed a Selective Service Advisory Committee to work with General Hershey and his officers; and that group—namely, the Advisory Committee, General Hershey, and his officers—did all of the detail work following the enactment of the act, to and including the appointment of Dr. Clarence Dykstra as Director of Selective Service on October 17, 1940, 1 day following the registration of all of the men between 21 and 35 years of age. In the interim preceding the appointment of Dr. Dykstra, the President, by two Executive orders, authorized General Hershey to perform all of the authority conferred upon the Director of Selective Service by the rules and regulations which he had prescribed, together with the authority to appoint local board members and other personnel of the Selective Service System which were necessarily required in order to conduct the registration and perform the other functions required under the act. This authority was to terminate upon the appointment of a Director of Selective Service. General Hershey served as Dr. Dykstra's first assistant and executive officer until December 19, 1940, when he was appointed Deputy Director by the President, and was confirmed by the Senate.

Dr. Dykstra served as Director of Selective Service from October 17, 1940, to March 21, 1941, during which time he relied upon General Hershey and the civilian officers in national headquarters and in State headquarters.

Such relationship, together with the full cooperation of the Governors who accepted responsibility for the decentralized operation of Selective Service within their respective States, resulted in the closest coordination and teamwork, and in the smooth and orderly operation of the Selective Service System, which is a matter of record. Following Dr. Dykstra's resignation, no new Di-

rector of Selective Service was appointed until July 31, 1941. During that time General Hershey administered the Selective Service System under the authority vested in him as Deputy Director, until he was appointed Director of Selective Service by the President, and was confirmed by the Senate on July 31, 1941.

In addition to General Hershey, whose semicivilian and semimilitary attributes I have already covered at length, there are not more than 5 officers of the Regular armed forces—3 of whom are retired—participating in the administration of the Selective Service System. The other officers presently on active duty with the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are civilians who are but temporarily in the armed forces. They are in number 566 in the Army, 71 in the Navy, and 55 in the Marine Corps. In addition to these representatives of the Selective Service System, there are approximately 187,803 representatives of the Selective Service System who are civilians. 164,274 of whom are uncompensated.

The Members of the Senate know General Hershey, and each Member of the House of Representatives knows the civilian Reserve officers or civilian National Guard officers who are in national headquarters or in his respective State and who come from his respective district. They have received long training and experience on the back ground and operations of selective service and the procurement of manpower, and are well qualified to administer the Selective Service System. When we praise the local representatives of the Selective Service System serving on the local boards, appeal boards, and in other capacities, we should not overlook these civilian officers serving both in national headquarters and under the Governors and State directors in the respective State headquarters, for they have done their best to make the System work. Many of them, because of their belief in General Hershey and in the fundamental principles of selective service with which they became indoctrinated in the years preceding the enactment of the Selective Service Act, voluntarily came to duty in 1940 at the request of General Hershey at a considerable personal sacrifice, and at a time when there was no provision of law under which they could be ordered to active duty. They felt a personal loyalty to General Hershey, and felt a moral and patriotic obligation to comply with his request more than a year preceding Pearl Harbor, and at a time when many persons sincerely believed we would not be directly engaged in the war.

General Hershey and these civilian officers have, therefore, been in selective-service planning and selective-service operations during this entire time, and they are qualified because of their attitude and experience to administer this act.

Consider what the situation would have been if this selective-service planning had not been done and if General Hershey and the civilian officers had not been thoroughly trained and had not

been available to participate in the administration of the Selective Service System. I wish that planning for other wartime operations had been conducted with comparable efficiency and foresight, and that all of our wartime agencies were staffed with personnel having comparable training and experience in the line of work which they are undertaking.

A very important additional factor should be kept in mind, namely, that the operations of the Selective Service System have been nonpolitical and must remain that way in order to continue to have public confidence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire merely to make a notation, both in connection with what the Senator from Vermont has said with regard to the connection of General Hershey with the National Guard, and more particularly in connection with the matter inserted in the Record a little while ago by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] in well-justified glorification of the Thirty-sixth Division, made up of the National Guard of Texas and Oklahoma.

I desire merely to note, Mr. President—at this time, when the effort of the General Staff of the Regular Army is to discredit the National Guard of the United States, break up its organizations, and if possible make impossible the reestablishment of the National Guard after this war—that the first two divisions which landed at Salerno, in one of the most difficult operations of all time from a military standpoint, were two National Guard divisions.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that the National Guard divisions of the United States and the smaller organizations into which the National Guard divisions have been broken up by the jealousy of the Regular Army at various times, will show equal valor and equal efficiency in their military operations in the future. I believe that a notation of the fact that the first two divisions to land at Salerno, in what is admittedly such a very difficult military operation, were National Guard divisions, is the smallest possible tribute that can be paid to the gallant men who made up the National Guard before the war started.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I urge Senators to confine themselves from now on until the bill has been disposed of, to the matter before the Senate. It is desirable not to hold a session tomorrow if it can be avoided. The soldiers' vote bill is the unfinished business and will come up on Monday. It is, therefore, desirable that action on the bill now before the Senate to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts be concluded today. I hope Senators will forego the pleasure of addressing the Senate on other matters, at least until that bill is disposed of. I am sure the Senate will stay in session long enough to hear any Senator who wishes to speak on any subject this afternoon, but it is very important that the bill be disposed of.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I desire to supplement what has been said by my colleagues in regard to the work of the National Guard men and the National

Guard officers. I call attention to the fact the Munda airport battle, the Rendova Island battle, and other battles in the Solomons campaign were won by the Forty-third, the Thirty-seventh, and part of one other division—particularly the Forty-third Division, which is an old National Guard division which was commanded by Maj. Gen. Leonard Wing, of Vermont, who worked his way up through the National Guard to the position he now holds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the divisions which participated in the capture of the Munda Airport was the Ohio National Guard Division, the Thirty-seventh Division, under the command of Major General Beightler, who was a general in the National Guard. He commanded the Thirty-seventh Division at the battle of Munda Airport.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has said. I understand that the National Guard Division from Ohio was very close behind the Forty-third Division in landing on Rendova Island and entering upon the Munda Airport.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not in the Chamber during the entire period consumed by the very able Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] in discussing the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts. I am sorry I was not present, because I have a very great affection for the Senator from Florida, and I regret exceedingly that at this hour I find myself in opposition to his ideas in reference to the repeal of those acts.

Since I first came to the Senate I have opposed all immigration into this country, and vigorously did so during those years when we had anywhere from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people out of employment. I oppose any change in our immigration laws at the present time, because I recognize, with Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that after the termination of this war we shall have millions of Americans on the streets looking for jobs.

I happen to be for Americans first. I happen—perhaps unfortunately in the eyes of some—to be one of those who are more interested in the welfare of native-born and naturalized citizens than that of others. I believe that every American job should be held by an American citizen, whether he be a native-born citizen or a naturalized citizen. I draw no line of distinction whatsoever between those who are born upon American soil and those who come here from other countries and later become American citizens. Some of the ablest Members of this body were born on foreign shores, and over the years they have been among our most outstanding Members.

Mr. President, the bill before us at the present time, designated as House bill 3070, is for the purpose of repealing the

Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes. I read from the report one paragraph thereof entitled "Purpose of the Bill":

The legislation proposed in this bill is for the purpose of repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, to place Chinese persons on a small quota basis, and to make persons of the Chinese race eligible to become naturalized United States citizens.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to repeat, I vigorously oppose any change in our immigration laws, because I recognize that at the present time we have more than seven million soldiers, sailors, and men of the air in uniform in this country and on 72 fighting fronts throughout the world. Those men are fighting for the life of America. They are fighting for the preservation of the American way of life, as we have heretofore known it. I say that when they return at the expiration of the war those heroes will be entitled to any jobs which are to spare on these shores.

I recognize that today we are experiencing war hysteria. If anyone states that a certain thing is going to help win the war, there is always support for it; but I state emphatically that permission to allow 105 Chinese to enter this country every year is not going to help win the war. I want any jobs available after this war to go to our soldiers. I am going to fight for those soldiers; and when I vote against repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts, I believe conscientiously in my heart and soul that I am voting for every American man and woman in uniform with the United States armed forces today. Not only that, but I am ready and willing to vote for anything that will be of help to those men and women who have been dislocated, so to speak, from civilian life and taken into the armed forces in order that they might be able to help win the war, which they are now doing. I am for the American soldier, sailor, and airman, not by way of mere words. I am going to evidence my interest in the American soldier by casting my vote for him every time I have an opportunity to do so.

In that connection, I understand that the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has just introduced a bill to provide a cash payment to every man in the armed forces immediately upon his return to American soil. I shall support that bill, recognizing as I do that the able Senator from Kentucky is interested, as I am, in the American soldier, and that we should give the men and women in uniform every possible consideration.

Mr. President, many of us forget too soon. I remember, as do other Senators, when we had between 10,000,000 and 13,000,000 people out of employment in this country; and during the same hours, weeks, and months when we had millions of people out of employment in America we were permitting thousands of people to come to our land from foreign shores and compete with American citizens for American jobs. I am against the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts.

Not so long ago a very able gentleman by the name of Multer, president of the

Sons of the American Revolution, delivered an address on Americanism. In the course of his remarks he made this observation:

All immigration laws would be repealed so that the citizens of the world could move about and locate where they please the same as citizens of the United States can change their residence from State to State. It requires no imagination to foresee that millions would come here to enjoy "the more abundant life" rather than to stay home to build up and struggle amid the ruins and desolations of war. Indeed, people from all over the earth would hasten here to the land, where, they are told, the streets are paved with gold. As a consequence, our standards of living, whether in the factory, on the farm, or in commercial pursuits, would soon go down to the level of the Hottentot. And so we might go on.

If we were to follow the advice of some radical internationalists, we would permit anyone from any country in the world to come to the United States and take over the United States of America.

In the course of the able address delivered by him at Williamsburg, one of the most historic spots in all America, Mr. Multer further said:

While millions of immigrants came to our shores, the great majority came to enjoy the blessings found under our form of government and became imbued with the spirit of our free institutions. It is true we closed the gates, when later on there began an influx of those whose ideas and customs and hereditary instincts were inimical to our way of life; and we intend to keep the gates closed.

I hope that we can keep them closed now, so far as the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts is concerned.

Let me say something further about the Chinese. I know of no better people. I have been to China a number of times. I have traveled all over China. I like the Chinese people immensely. They are hard workers. They are diligent, honest, trustworthy, and are very patriotic people. I have nothing against the Chinese. I am simply against permitting anyone to come into this country until such time as we have assimilated the 6,000,000 aliens we have on American soil at the present time. The Chinese are fine people. They are our allies. We who know them like them. The Japanese, who cannot trust themselves, always have hired Chinese to work in the Japanese banks, because the Japanese knew that their own cashiers, tellers, and bookkeepers were dishonest. They imported the Chinese, whom they knew to be honest, for the purpose of working in the Japanese banks.

I have nothing against the Chinese, but I have more interest in the United States of America and in Americans than I have in any other country or any other people on the face of the earth. Therefore, without hesitation, I speak this afternoon in what I believe to be the interest of America and the American people, because I am an American nationalist, and I believe in saving America for Americans.

There are those who would tell us that we should now repeal the Chinese exclusion law, that we should provide quotas for the Chinese, and then should admit

105 Chinese into this country annually. They say we should do that in order to evidence and make a display of our friendship to the Chinese Government. They say that if we will allow 105 Chinese to come into America annually it will help win the war. I do not understand such arguments. Every one of the 105 Chinese who would be permitted to come into this country would necessarily on examination be found to be a Chinaman of excellent character, and one who unquestionably would make for us a good American citizen. If what we read in the newspapers about the war between China and Japan is true, and doubtless it is true, in the hard fight Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is having in China, he needs every good, able-bodied citizen of China he can possibly get. I am sure Gen. Chiang Kai-shek does not want has good citizens, his able-bodied men, to leave China at a time when the Chinese are fighting for their very lives. He wants them to remain in China where they can help him. But by permitting them to come to this country, as provided under this bill, they would not do him any good at all. He wants them to remain in China.

I have not heard anyone say that China has requested the repeal of the exclusion law. Perhaps the Chinese have requested it. But are we going to comply with every request made by every country in the world to permit their nationals to enter this country? If we do we might just as well erase everything which stands for America, and which is imbedded in the minds of true Americans.

Mr. President, the American Federation of Labor is opposed to the repeal of this law. The American Federation of Labor takes that position because it represents millions of laborers in America. In an article published not many months ago Mr. Green stated that after the war ends there will be millions upon millions of American citizens, native-born and naturalized, walking the streets in search of jobs they cannot find. I respectfully submit to my colleagues in this, the upper House of Congress, that it is our duty to preserve every single job—one job or 105 jobs or millions of jobs. We should preserve those jobs for the men and women who return from the war. Today many of our uniformed men and women are giving their blood, laying down their lives, and dying in order that we may enjoy the American way of life in this land.

The propaganda for the passage of this legislation has been intense, but there are certain facts relating to the whole problem of Chinese exclusion which have not had the publicity their importance demands.

First, attention must be called to the fact that the President in his message to Congress characterized the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the prohibition against the naturalization of Chinese as something which should never have taken place.

The President further stated that—

Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

This seems an extraordinary pronouncement for the President to make; because had Congress not enacted the Chinese Exclusion Acts when it did, our country would now have on its hands a race problem. In fact, if Congress had not finally developed the principle of Chinese exclusion into total Asiatic exclusion, our existing Japanese problem would have been so magnified as to constitute a grave military menace.

The appalling nature of this menace is made perhaps more vivid if the statistics for the decade 1933-42 are analyzed. During this decade the British had available a total of 657,210 visas. Against this total, however, only 26,476 visas are charged. That leaves an unused balance of 630,734 visas. Had the United States not had in the immigration law a provision that persons ineligible to citizenship were not admissible, this unused balance of 630,734 would have been available for British subjects of Chinese descent who were born in one or another of the British dependencies, such as Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, and the Malay States, not to mention the West Indies, where a good many Chinese coolies have settled. Also, as immigration from the Western Hemisphere has never been placed on a quota basis, the descendants of the large number of Chinese who were permitted to migrate into various countries of Latin America could have moved here in a flood of indeterminable magnitude.

When these facts were brought before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the advocates of the policy of repealing Asiatic exclusion, so far as it applied to the Chinese, apparently realized that Congress, and the public at large when they understood the situation would not tolerate legislation of this character. Hence, House bill 3070, known as the Magnuson bill, is offered to the Congress as a measure to placate the Chinese and counteract the Japanese propaganda that our legislation is discriminatory against our ally, China.

The Andrews bill, if enacted, would establish a racial basis as distinguished from the existing system of determining quotas in accordance with national contributions to our population. By this method and a requirement that only 25 percent of the quota be given to Chinese born and resident in countries other than China, the intolerable evils attendant on giving China real equality with other quota countries whose citizens are now eligible to citizenship in the United States, are obviated. Unfortunately, this result would be just as discriminatory, and perhaps more so, than the present system which treats all Asiatics on exactly the same basis.

Mr. President, the provision of the act of 1924, excluding persons ineligible to citizenship in the United States was written into that act on economic grounds. Congress never took the position that the white race was superior to the Mongolian or other Asiatic races. Congress was, in fact, concerned over the indisputable fact that the white race is unable to compete with Asiatics in any industrial or agricultural enterprise in which labor costs determine success or failure.

If Congress can be said to have taken a position which by implication raises the question of racial superiority or inferiority, it must be admitted to have conceded the superiority of Asiatics as compared with whites.

The Andrews bill would establish a dangerous precedent by creating a racial quota as distinguished from the national quotas under which immigrants now enter from all quota countries whose citizens are eligible for citizenship in the United States. Such a precedent might be capitalized by anti-Semites because of the fact that people of the Hebrew race now come into the United States as nationals of the country of their birth. By reason of this fact, 43,450 Hebrews entered the United States in 1939, out of a total lawful immigration of 82,998 of all races. Under a racial quota, applicable to Hebrews, probably less than 6,000 could have entered the United States in any 1 year.

As it has been always opposed to the promotion of anti-Semitism, it regards the introduction of the principle of racial quotas into our immigration laws as a grave menace to national unity.

It will be seen that the Andrews bill does not place China on a parity with other quota nations whose citizens are eligible for citizenship in the United States. Therefore, this bill, S. 1404, is no answer to the charge of discrimination against the Chinese. If they do not meet this requirement, they are not only a futile gesture but they are a gesture which threatens a colossal breach in our immigration barriers. It can indeed be said that H. R. 3070 and S. 1404 threatens a breach in our immigration barriers because inasmuch as they will inevitably fail to satisfy the Chinese, the next step will be to open wide the flood gates of a Chinese migration into the United States.

Furthermore, if this bill should be enacted it is difficult to see how Congress could consistently refuse to grant to other Asiatic states or races equality with the Chinese. As the quota list now stands, that policy would immediately add approximately 2,000 Asiatic immigrants as admissible for entry under the minimum quotas now assigned. Also, many thousands of Asiatics now resident in the United States would become eligible for citizenship. When naturalized, these Asiatics of all races, including the Chinese, will be entitled to bring in an endless chain of relatives.

The persistent introduction of special bills to legalize the entry of individual Asiatics of various racial origins and the propaganda circulated for their passage is good evidence of the fact that as soon as the Andrews bill is passed, if it should be passed, a campaign for its extension to other Asiatic peoples will be initiated.

The argument that the British India people are entitled to entry and to naturalization because they are fighting Japan would be identical with and just as cogent as that used to pass the Andrews bill in the Senate.

Should British India disintegrate into its component States and minimum quotas be assigned on the present basis to such States, we could reasonably expect a migration of from ten to fifty

thousand Asiatics a year, over and above the 105 Chinese to be admitted if the Andrews bill should be enacted.

There is, of course, a solution to this problem which can offend no race and no nation. That is, the enactment of total exclusion of all immigration, except the wives and minor children of persons lawfully resident in the United States. If Congress adopts this policy, it may then, but only then, be justified in repealing the prohibition against the naturalization of Chinese who are now lawful residents of the United States.

Inasmuch as the number of unemployed in the United States during the 10 years preceding our entry into the war ranged from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 people, and even more on occasion, is it not reasonable to suggest to Congress that it hold all American jobs, even 105 American jobs, as a sacred trust for the men and women in our armed forces now engaged in war? These men and women are battling enemies who are seeking to conquer the United States by force of arms. How can Congress, therefore, justify a grant of permission to any race of people the privilege of conquering our country by peaceful infiltration of immigrants through breaches in our immigration laws.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement containing a review of facts pertinent to this question, which I wish to present at this time.

First. The original controversy between China and Japan arose over the inspired immigration of Japanese subjects into Manchuria. These Japanese subjects leased lands from Chinese peasants and when the Chinese landlords sought to resume occupancy of the lands on the expiration of the leases, the Japanese tenants would not give up the properties. The Chinese landlords naturally organized into bands to expel their tenants, and then the Japanese Government publicized to the world that these landlords were bandits. Whatever the merits of that phase of the quarrel were, it was the migration of Japanese subjects into Manchuria which became the basic cause of the conflict now raging throughout the East.

Second. The war between China and Japan, which began 4 years before we entered the struggle, was China's war for the survival of China as a nation. The threat suggested by some of the sponsors of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts that China may desert the United Nations and join Japan in a war for Asia for the Asiatics, if such legislation be not passed, is international political blackmail. It is blackmail against an ally now mobilizing all its forces to crush China's traditional enemy, Japan.

Third. If the sponsors of this legislation are consistent in their attitude that China must get what she demands, they must be prepared to take a position on the question of returning Hong Kong to China, or to England of which it has been a dependency for many years. Are United States forces to be permitted to reconquer Chinese territory for reincorporation in the British Empire, or are they to be used to restore Hong Kong to China from which the British took it.

Fourth. The argument advanced by selfish financial interests that the repeal of this legislation is necessary to assure preferential treatment for American business is controverted by the intense propaganda now being circulated for a post-war world in which no such preferences shall be granted.

On the basis of the facts set forth above, it is obvious that no good purpose will be served by the passage of the bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts. Such a course will inevitably lead to demands that the whole structure of legislation providing for exclusion of all Asiatics be abolished.

As has already been said, the way to end once and for all the charge of discrimination against any race or people, is to exclude immigration from every source.

The way to prove our friendship for China is to provide adequate military support to our military and naval officers now leading our armies and fleets in a supreme effort to defeat Japan.

Mr. President, I have before me a report of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor submitted at the sixty-third annual convention held in Boston, Mass., on October 4, 1943. I ask that the portions of the report which I have designated be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA-FOLLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Numerous proposals modifying immigration and naturalization laws are pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress, as those who favor opening the immigration doors are fully alive to the situation and realize that circumstances have now created ideal conditions for the accomplishment of their purposes.

Generally speaking, the pending measures excuse those who entered the country illegally, remove existing immigration bars even against Chinese, and make naturalization a farce in many instances.

Many of these proposals emanate from those in high places, and toward the end of the Seventy-seventh Congress three bills granting the President the power to vitiate all immigration and tariff laws were introduced at his request. These proposals were defeated in committee after many modifying amendments were considered in executive session.

Antirestrictionists of immigration are proceeding very boldly by advocating repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, realizing that if this portion of the immigration laws is repealed they will encounter little difficulty in securing entry for those in whom they are really interested. They rely on the popularity of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and the gallant fight of the Chinese against the Japanese for this purpose.

As there are no quotas in the Western Hemisphere, West Indians, Mexicans, and others are being brought into this country by the tens of thousands.

When this war ends the return of the millions in the armed forces and the adjustment of industry from a war to a consumer basis will create an unemployment problem never previously known. It will be absolutely impossible for this country to absorb the millions now desirous of immigrating to the United States.

The representatives of the American Federation of Labor have followed the immigration restriction policies as laid down by American Federation of Labor conventions and in regard to the pending bills these policies should be adhered to as it will be impossible for the workers in this country to compete with a flood of European and Asiatic immigrants.

One of the first acts of the first convention of the American Federation of Labor held in 1881 (p. 4) was to declare:

"Thirty years' experience of the Pacific coast with Chinese had proved their competition with white labor was the greatest evil with which a country could be afflicted; that publicity as to its true character be disseminated throughout the country and Congress urged to enact an exclusion act."

In 1882 great demonstrations against Chinese immigration were made throughout the country, all participated in by representatives of the American Federation of Labor, and a law was enacted which was made ineffective by administrative and court actions.

The question of Chinese exclusion was one of the most important questions pending before American Federation of Labor conventions, beginning with its first one, and including the present law enacted in 1924, which prohibits the entry into this country of persons ineligible to citizenship.

As Chinese, Japanese, and others of oriental blood are, under law, ineligible to citizenship, such persons cannot emigrate to this country.

From its inception the American Federation of Labor has vigorously maintained that orientals should be barred from entering this country and that they should not be permitted to become citizens.

The advocates of repeal of Chinese exclusion muster many specious arguments in favor of the proposal and minimize its importance, contending that but 105 will enter the United States annually. However, repeal means the doors are open to Chinese and in order to be consistent the next step will be to permit all orientals to emigrate to the United States and become citizens.

Once the bar is raised agitation will begin to permit the entry of such races in ever-increasing numbers.

The fact that China is our ally in the present world war should not influence us to permit repeal of the oriental exclusion law any more than the fact that Russia is an ally should influence us to embrace communism.

The executive council directs that the officers of the American Federation of Labor carry out the decisions of conventions regarding immigration exclusion laws.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this reveals the fact that the American Federation of Labor has gone on record innumerable times as opposing the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law.

I have before me a letter from the New York Herald Tribune of October 14, 1943, written by J. H. B. Hoffmann, entitled "Would Not Admit Asiatics," which I ask to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD NOT ADMIT ASIATICS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I am sorry the administration has lent its support to the Magnuson bill providing for quota immigration of Chinese. It would have been much better, I think, had President

Roosevelt and Secretary Hull explained to Generalissimo Chiang, Mme. Chiang and Mr. Soong that our oriental exclusion laws are based on the plain fact that the races are too different from us to assimilate readily, and that recognition of this fact implies no disparagement or reflection on the merits per se of any Asiatic people.

If we now compromise this basic principle underlying oriental exclusion, Koreans, Hindus and other east Asiatics will want their quotas. There is a large "liberal" minority among us who want to break down the barriers, whose ideal United States of America would be a sort of multiracial, polyglot mosaic of peoples all united by a sort of religion called "democracy." Personally, I believe that God created all men equal, but He also created them different.

J. H. B. HOFFMANN.

NEW YORK, October 14, 1943.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have another letter which sometime ago I clipped from the columns of the Washington News, of Washington, D. C., signed by Edward R. Lewis entitled "Quota of 105 Would Not Always Satisfy Chinese," which I ask to have published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTA OF 105 WOULD NOT ALWAYS SATISFY CHINESE

There seems to be a vast amount of misunderstanding on the question of Chinese exclusion. We are told that all that is involved is 105 Chinese immigrants a year. But if Chinese exclusion is repealed, there would be no tenable argument after this war to deny admission as immigrants to the Japanese, Hindus, Malays, and all other people of the brown and yellow races. I count at least 20 countries with people of the brown and yellow races, each of which would be entitled in all fairness to a minimum quota of 100, if China is granted a quota. This makes 2,000 immigrants of the brown and yellow races each year, instead of a mere 105.

Secondly, we may be certain that neither the Japanese nor the Chinese would ever remain satisfied with a paltry minimum quota of 105 when several European countries have quotas of several thousand each.

Thirdly, we may be certain that neither Japan nor China would allow white American common laborers or farm laborers to enter their countries.

Finally, there is no insult asserted or intended by the policy of Japanese or Chinese exclusion. There is no assertion that the Japanese, Hindus, Malays, or Chinese are inferior. There is merely an assertion that the introduction of yellow and brown common laborers would eventually lead to grievous race trouble in this country.

EDWARD R. LEWIS.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at Lynn, Mass., on November 18, 1943, the Honorable James A. Farley addressed the Rotary International. In his speech he made this one remark:

I think the war will be over sooner than some people expect. After the war, there will be an economic upset. Millions will be thrown out of work.

I wish to impress the Members of this body with the fact that I and many others think that immediately succeeding the war millions of men will be out of employment and without work of any sort.

The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, has as its national secretary Mr. James R. Wilmeth, of Philadelphia, Pa. He has directed to me a letter as of November 1, 1943, in vigorous opposition to the passage of the pending bill. I ask that the portion of his letter which I have not deleted be published in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The Chinese were undesirable as immigrants and citizens to such an extent that, in 1882, under solemn treaty with their mother country, the United States enacted exclusion laws—61 years ago.

2. Chinese laborers, working for small wages, were in direct competition with the American workmen.

3. Chinese worked for such low wages that our American working people would starve to death working for such wages.

4. The use of opium was introduced into this country by the Chinese. They established dens of vice and opium joints, and engaged in tong wars and other unlawful customs and practices.

5. Chinese in this country today would offer the same competition, at low wages, as resulted during the period of their admission as immigrants, prior to 1882. To admit them at this time as immigrants would present destructive competition which would be demoralizing, and Chinamen admitted, no matter how small the number, would take the jobs which ought to be held and preserved for our returning victorious soldiers.

6. The quota of 105, which is argued with so much force by the proponents, appears to be misleading. It does not take into account Chinamen who are living in British territory, such as Honk Kong, Canada, and the South American republics, who, under the immigration laws, are admitted regardless of the quotas. There are no quotas for the Western Hemisphere; therefore Chinamen could be admitted on the same terms as other subjects of Canada and the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

7. In the admission of any immigrants, we should give first consideration to the good of America and its people. The burden of arguments of the proponents of these repeal measures seems to be that America owes it to the Chinese people to break down the immigration barriers, and let them in, on the grounds of sentimentality.

8. Good common-sense American business demands that we look out for our own interest first, and to the providing of jobs for our own citizens, before that of any foreign country; and particularly for our returning soldiers.

9. Following the victorious conclusion of this war, it is safe to assume that, after some time, we shall find ourselves in the depths of another depression, with many of our own people out of employment. Good business sense demands that, in our planning for an after-war program, we take into consideration our own citizens, and their best interest, before we attempt to include Chinese, or any other class of immigrants.

10. The yellow race is not assimilable with the white or Caucasian race. The introduction of a large number of Asiatic orientals at this time would complicate the race situation in the United States. We have all the race troubles at the present time that we can handle. Why complicate, by the introduction of unassimilable people of the yellow race, no matter how small the number?

11. Communism has been introduced into China during the last decade or two. If we are to believe the reports we read, there are large numbers of Chinese people, who have espoused, and are devoted to the doctrines and principles of communism. The introduction of even a small number of Chinese who are indoctrinated with communism will further complicate our political and economic condition.

We have followed the debates in the House of Representatives, and are forced to the conclusion that sentiment and sympathy appear to be the moving considerations of those who are advocates of the repeal. It has been argued that China is now an ally of the United States in the war against Japan, and that Japan is using the exclusion laws of the United States against China, in their radio broadcasts, to belittle the United States and to turn the Chinese people against us. We submit that those who have hung their support of the repeal on the propaganda peg will find that, in the event the exclusion laws are repealed, with only 105 Chinamen eligible to enter the United States in any one given fiscal year, Japan will have a real reason for belittling us, and using propaganda against such a feeble legislative gesture. In our opinion, this will be one of the most fruitful sources of hurtful propaganda against the United States, if the admission of 105 Chinese to the United States is the measure of our regard for them; considering that there are nearly 500,000,000 Chinese subjects, then we may expect that Japan will get busy with the Chinese people to show them how small is our regard for them, as reflected in such a bill. In our testimony before the House Immigration Committee, we brought out the fact that if this measure were intended simply to appease the Chinese people, it was a very feeble gesture.

We submit that the question of changing an immigration law that has been in force for 62 years, with such small benefits to the Chinese people, while we are in the midst of a global war, with some 10,000,000 of American boys far away from their own homes and country, fighting to preserve our liberties, is, to say the least, a questionable legislative procedure.

That this repeal is controversial is shown by the hearings before the House Immigration Committee and the debates before the House of Representatives. It is a pity that it should be brought out at such a time. We fail to see where there is going to be a great deal of benefit accrue to the Chinese people, in the event the Chinese exclusion laws are repealed. Very few can come from the mainland of China, hardly enough to count. As an ally, in this global war, China will have to look to more substantial things than that proposed in this measure, if she is to be greatly benefited. We submit that what China needs at the present time is not immigration laws which will permit 105 of her citizens to come into the United States but she needs more in the way of food, airplanes, and soldiers to help her win the war against Japan. America is giving such supplies in rather large measure to the Chinese people. We are encouraging her in a substantial way in her war effort. Money has been loaned in excess of \$500,000,000, which it is doubtful will ever be repaid. In the matter of food, \$200,000,000 worth, and in war munitions, under the Lend-Lease Act; while American boys have been fighting on Chinese soil to help protect and save her integrity. It is likely that, in the next year or so, many thousands of our American soldiers will tread upon Chinese soil, with guns on their backs, helping her to defeat Japan. We submit that these things we are doing for the Chinese people now fully demonstrate our interest in and for them. Now, to resort to an appeasement bill by Congress is a small sop, which

will amount to but little; in fact, will contribute nothing toward enabling China to win the war against Japan.

What China needs now is more of what we have been doing for her, in a substantial way. We submit that, if this law should be passed, it will not contribute one iota toward the Chinese victory over Japan. If this statement will be true, why should America go out of her way to lower the immigration barriers and standards in what appears to be an almost meaningless effort, so far as the Chinese proper, is concerned.

We submit that this legislative attempt to change the immigration status of the Chinese people is one that has been promoted chiefly here in our own country. There are people in America who would sponsor legislation of almost any kind if it was found that it would break down our immigration laws. It seems to us that this present attempt to repeal these laws is intended to accomplish that very purpose.

We submit that we are not only helping China in a most substantial manner at the present time in her heroic struggle, but we have been her friend for decades. The United States, through its good offices, prevented partition being made of China, following the Boxer Rebellion. We have been her friend in trade and commerce. We have welcomed her sons and daughters to our schools, colleges, and universities, here in America, year by year, in numbers far beyond what the sponsors of this measure claim will be extended to the Chinese people in the way of admissible immigrants. There has been reciprocal trade and commerce, and the United States and China have enjoyed the respect and admiration, one for the other, governmentally speaking, which, in our judgment, would not be influenced or enlarged by the repeal of the exclusion laws.

We submit that the exclusion laws of 1882 were passed, upon tacit understanding and agreement by the Government of China that if their nationals became embarrassing to the United States their Government would not object to the imposition of such exclusion laws. That is exactly what was done, and the treaty was passed upon such understandings and agreements. Why change now, when, as we understand, China has not requested our Government to do so?

Under the high tempo of war we are apt to do many things which, in a sober, calmer moment, we would not attempt to do. This repeal seems to be a war experiment which may be ended before any of these 105 immigrants could land on our shores. Why rush in and upset the immigrant status quo of 61 years, because we are running in high war gear?

We submit, finally, that it will not be to the interest of our country to enact such legislation at this time. America is the asylum of more immigrants than any country on the face of the earth. We have many more than our share, nationally speaking. It is time for us to give serious consideration to the welfare of our own people, and our institutions and our Government, before we further extend immigration privileges to other peoples and nations. The thing which should determine what we should do in a case of this kind is, "Will it be for the best interest of our Government and our people for us to do this or that particular thing?" In the light of the foregoing statement, we submit that the best interest of our country is to let the Chinese immigration laws remain as they are at present on our statute books.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES L. WILMETH,
National Secretary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In addition to that, Mr. President, I have a letter from the

legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Washington, Spokane, Wash., over the signature of W. J. Wallace, protesting against the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law. Attached to the letter is a petition to the Congress of the United States. I ask that the letter, together with the petition, be published in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Seattle, Wash., October 8, 1943.

R. R. REYNOLDS,

United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are very much interested in defeating any legislation that will in any way let down the bars to permit emigration to these United States. Let us first prove our ability to furnish adequate employment to the bonified citizens that are at present within and entitled to be within the continental limits of these United States, that they may be able to follow such gainful occupations that will enable them a livelihood without having to accept of that morale-destroying system or systems such as P. W. A., W. P. A., or direct relief. We look upon this scurrilous attempt, by legislation, to insert an entering wedge into the Chinese exclusion laws.

We, you, and other legislators are expressing our opinions as to how rehabilitation of our people is to be accomplished when this war is over and I am sure, on your giving it a mere casual thought, your honest opinion will be that rehabilitation of our own citizens, who, at present go to make up the population of these United States, cannot be accomplished and that objective reached, if in any way the laws of immigration are relaxed. It is our opinion that, the laws governing emigration of all nationalities should be tightened, and it would be provident to close the gates of these United States entirely. We, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do request that you use that American prerogative endowed by that wonderful document, the Constitution of these United States.

Truly yours,

W. J. WALLACE.

We, the members of Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in regular session assembled: Being aware of the fact that, in the year 1939, the Chief Executive of these United States, did request, that the Congress of our country reduce immigration quotas of all nationalities, and quotas so gained be applied to refugees from Germany and Austria, said refugees be privileged to enter and flood these United States with undesirables of all nations; and

Whereas other legislation would be inimical to the well-being of the bona fide citizens of these United States through the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, and a matter of record, That Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do oppose the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and declare such legislation detrimental to the welfare of the citizens of these United States, and would definitely destroy any and all efforts of rehabilitation of both War No. 1 and No. 2.

Comrades, it is essential that the immigration laws of our country be revised, and in doing so, close any and all loopholes, thus

tightening up on various provisions. Too, it would not be improvident to close the gates of immigration for a period of 20 years. Incidentally, comrades and sisters, if we are to successfully carry out our huge program of rehabilitation of our comrades of these wars, it will be necessary to stop the visitation of the open-armed policy upon those of foreign lands. First, let us prove our ability to care for our own, the bona fide citizens of this great Republic. These are facts, comrades and sisters, and by checkmating their activities we will be able to prevent a repetition of what transpired from 1928 to 1939—the P. W. A., W. P. A., and direct relief of our people while some 5,000,000 aliens in our midst were holding down white-collared positions in this United States. Think ! over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, if we repeal the Chinese exclusion law, it will mean merely the opening wedge. It will mean merely the sticking of the big toe in the door which many radical internationalists want to open up. Next, if the big toe gets into that door, as provided by the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, we will find the foot, then the leg, then the whole body, and all the immigration gates of America will be opened up to the peoples of the world to come here and compete with our own people.

Mr. President, I wish to have published at this point, as a part of my remarks, in order that the time of the Senate may be saved, a letter addressed to me by Mr. James S. Farley, 162 West Seventy-eighth Street, New York City, under date of October 18, 1943, in which he provides me with a report of the grand jury of the State of New York entitled "Post-war Peril in Immigration." The grand jury, after having studied the immigration matter for several months, made some very pertinent and valuable points. I wish to have the report published in the RECORD, as they recommended against the wholesale immigration we are experiencing at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR PERIL IN IMMIGRATION¹

In a presentation which predicted an unprecedented "wave of proposed immigration" after the war, the Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York, which returned indictments in the German-American Bund cases last year, recommended that "selective immigration" be adopted in the United States to avoid placing the Nation in the gravest jeopardy in the post-war period.

The presentment, which specifically urges that aliens be required to speak, read, and write the English language on at least an eighth-grade level before being admitted to citizenship, was handed up to Judge J. Waties Waring in the United States district court last Friday and was made public yesterday by A. Vere Shaw, jury foreman, who is a senior partner in the firm of investment counselors bearing his name at 15 William Street.

Mr. Shaw said the grand jury convened on May 19, 1942, and after it had completed its work in the bund cases, which led to the conviction up to last October of 27 persons on charges of conspiracy to violate the Selective

¹Federal grand jury report, southern district of New York, September 21, 1943.

Training and Service Act of 1940, the jury members held themselves in session to look into the immigration and naturalization problem. The jury was discharged last Friday.

The presentment, which was signed by 22 members of the jury, stated that it is the unanimous opinion of the jury that the "safety of this country and its institutions is being jeopardized" because undesirable aliens have been and may be admitted into this country as immigrants and naturalized as citizens and because the supervision and education of aliens and the facilities for continued education of naturalized citizens by the Government of this country are not adequate.

The presentment said that this conviction was arrived at by the jury after hearing, over a period of months, the testimony of a great number of naturalized citizens, "many of whom had been living in this country for a long period of years."

"Some of these witnesses," the presentment said, "were virtually unable to speak or understand English. Many could not read or write English. Others appeared to be wholly illiterate."

The presentment said that the "jury believes in immigration, but in selective immigration." "It affirms the principle that, in all legislation governing immigration, the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant," the presentment read.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, this is merely the opening wedge. As soon as the war is over, there will be a great drive to break down the barriers, to open up the gates, to let millions of Chinese come into the United States in competition with American labor, whether it is native-born or naturalized.

Let us look a little into the future. A few days ago Mr. LaGuardia, the mayor of New York City, issued a statement in which he recommended seasonal immigration. That is referred to in an Associated Press dispatch dated November 12. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEASONAL IMMIGRATION PROPOSED BY LAGUARDIA

NEW YORK, November 12.—Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, advocating a plan for seasonal immigration of workers after the war, said yesterday the Nation's public education system had depleted the ranks of unskilled labor by training youths for skilled and professional jobs.

"The country can't continue the course of its great public education system and then expect to have unskilled labor," he said at the formal opening of new district headquarters of the National Immigration and Naturalization Service. "There is going to be a shortage of unskilled and farm labor and we must make up our minds what we are going to do about it."

The mayor said a policy could be worked out by Congress "to bring in workers when they are needed: A given number for a given period of time."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, just prior to that, on November 6, I clipped from the New York Herald Tribune an article which will provide us with some foresight into what we may expect in the

future so far as breaking down our immigration barriers and opening up our gates is concerned. I read the headline:

United States may import million Italians to meet shortage of manpower.

Plan, under consideration in Washington, would go into effect if war lasted long enough; not only war prisoners would be used.

The article is by Mr. Bert Andrews, and is dated Washington, D. C., November 6. Another paragraph reads:

The plan, stripped to its barest essentials, is to bring 1,000,000 Italians from their homeland to the United States for the duration of the manpower emergency.

I ask that the article be published in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, November 7, 1943]

UNITED STATES MAY IMPORT MILLION ITALIANS TO MEET SHORTAGE OF MANPOWER—PLAN, UNDER CONSIDERATION IN WASHINGTON, WOULD GO INTO EFFECT IF WAR LASTED LONG ENOUGH; NOT ONLY WAR PRISONERS WOULD BE USED

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, November 6.—The truest words that have been spoken recently in Washington—and this is not intended to suggest that anybody ever tells a lie in the Nation's Capital—came from Walter Brown, assistant to James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. Brown had been asked by telephone to comment on a published article, complete with charts, which purported to contain the complete low-down on the Roosevelt administration's plan for returning the national economy to a peacetime basis after the war.

Mr. Brown said he had no personal knowledge of the plan, but did not dismiss it as a possibility.

"Everybody has a plan," he said. "There are hundreds of plans."

While Mr. Brown was speaking only about plans for the post-war period, what he said was equally true as applied to plans for the period of the war—whether it turns out to be short or long.

For example (and at this point a formal farewell is taken for Mr. Brown so that no one will think any of the rest of this came from him) there is a startling plan under serious consideration in high official circles as to how to solve the labor shortage—particularly in agriculture—if the conflict goes on long enough to require drastic additional drafting of America's manpower.

The plan, stripped to its barest essentials, is to bring 1,000,000 Italians from their homeland to the United States for the duration of the manpower emergency!!!!

The five exclamation points that close the foregoing sentence were put there after due consideration, with the thought that each exclamation point could symbolize a dozen question marks that have been raised as the new subject has been battled back and forth in the high councils.

Anyone who glances at the proposal invariably adds many questions of his own, but the following list shows the chief ones already raised, with the answers from the advocates of the proposal:

Question. When would the Italians be brought here?

Answer. Only when the labor shortage grows stringent enough to make it imperative to obtain additional manpower.

Question. Would the American people stand for the idea?

Answer. If the labor shortage grew severe enough, they'd welcome it.

Question. Would war prisoners only be brought?

Answer. No. The idea would be to get voluntary recruits. They could be transported easily on ships that are now returning empty from the war zones.

Question. How would they be paid? And how much?

Answer. By the employers, under Government supervision. They'd get prevailing wages.

Question. Would they be allowed to keep all the money?

Answer. No indeed; part of the money would be withheld with the aim of keeping Uncle Sam from becoming Uncle Sucker.

Question. How would you do that?

Answer. Well, in the first place they'd be charged for the boat rides. All the other details haven't been worked out, but consider some of the other possibilities. Presumably they would be subject to normal taxes, and goodness knows we need all the tax revenue we can get. They would be eating here—and paying for it. That would save us the cost of sending food to Italy to give away to them. They would be required to send money home to relatives. Thus those relatives would have money to pay for supplies, instead of being able to demand them free as the right of starving people.

Question. How about getting them back after the war?

Answer. They would come in under Government supervision. They would be subject to Government supervision and regulations, including fingerprinting. They would be brought in for a specified time; all would be subject to repatriation beginning, say, a month after the armistice.

Question. But how would you move a million Italians home in a brief time?

Answer. How have we moved soldiers in wartime? Besides, we'll have ships galore. This mass movement not only would keep them busy, but the shipping lines would get paid in cash, since the Italian workers would have had money withheld for their passage.

Question. But what about the labor unions? Wouldn't there be a terrific kick from them about bringing in Italian labor?

Answer. Most obstacles could be knocked down. Suppose additional labor were absolutely essential to assure an adequate food supply. Wouldn't that remove some of the objections? Suppose safeguards were thrown up so that in no event could the use of such labor injure the rights or prevailing wages of labor. Wouldn't that help, too?

Question. Does that mean that the Italian labor would be kept entirely out of unionized industries?

Answer. Presumably there would be no need for them in such industries. The need would come in fields from which labor had been drained off to provide for the demands of the armed services and war industries.

Question. Whew!

Answer. Whew! if you like. But while all this is just in the planning stage now, it will come to pass if the war goes on long enough. Depend upon that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, when we entered the war we had between five and six million aliens in the United States. Since war was declared on September 3, 1939—I believe it was 11 o'clock in the morning by Great Britain, and 5 o'clock in the afternoon by France—more than 480,000, nearly half a million, aliens have been permitted to enter the United States of America. While those 480,000, nearly half a million, aliens

from Europe, were coming into this country, our own American boys were being uniformed and sent to the lands of these aliens across the seas to fight for the freedom and the safety sought by the hundreds of thousands of aliens who left their lands and came to our land.

Mr. President, I hardly think that is right. I think able-bodied men of all European countries, whose lands were invaded by the Axis powers, should have stayed at home to have aided in the fighting of their countries' battles, instead of coming to America to bask in the sunshine of prosperity and safety, while our American sons went to their lands to lay down their lives for them.

So it is in connection with the proposed legislation we are now considering. While China is engaged in a death struggle, are we going to encourage the good citizens of China now to leave their country, where they are needed desperately by the Generalissimo himself, and come to the United States in search of gold, safety, and prosperity? I say that any man of China who would come to the United States, who would leave his land when his people are engaged in a death struggle, is not the kind of citizen we want here, because any Chinaman good enough to become an American citizen must be good enough to stay in his homeland and fight in behalf of his country, and therefore, I argue, he would not want to come here.

Mr. President, I have a number of papers on my desk dealing with the proposed legislation, which I could ask to insert in the RECORD, but I shall not do so. I do not want unduly to weigh down the RECORD.

Mr. President, some of the best citizens we have ever had in America are those who came from foreign countries and who were born on foreign shores. Some of the best citizens we have in this country today are naturalized American citizens. They are persons who have come from Poland, from Czechoslovakia, from Yugoslavia, from Albania, and from Greece; there are persons who have come from Estonia; Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland. They are all fine people. Those who are here make wonderful citizens. I know many of them personally. If we are going to let anyone in, let us make a reexamination of the whole question and permit to come in, first, the mothers, and the fathers, and the children, and the mothers, and the sisters of men and women who have previously come to America from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Greece, and Czechoslovakia.

I repeat that I know many fine citizens of foreign birth, and I repeat without hesitation that some of the finest citizens we have in America today were born on foreign soil. I recognize the fact that we can assimilate them, and that they make fine American citizens.

Not so long ago, when we had the Connally resolution up for consideration in the Senate, I submitted an amendment to the resolution which would guarantee the freedom and the political integrity of the territory of Poland, Yugoslavia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Greece, and all

other such countries. I did so because I have found that persons who have come from those soils were naturally interested in the political integrity of their home countries, and they are interested in matters relating to those countries. They make good American citizens.

Mr. President, I say that we should stop all immigration now for 1 year after the war, which would afford us sufficient time to make a reexamination and reappraisal of the immigration question, and to study the whole question and find out what groups we can assimilate and what groups we cannot assimilate; what groups we want and what groups we do not want. I do not think anyone would protest against such action.

I now wish to refer to the American Legion. My distinguished friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] stated to the Senate in an eloquent address today that the American Legion favored the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act. I read in that connection a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, October 28, 1943, entitled "Immigration," in which the following appears:

This resolution urges that "all immigration be barred from the United States from the date of the end of hostilities of the present war until employment has dropped to less than 1,000,000."

Mr. President, that is the language of a proposed amendment sent to me today by a representative of the American Legion with the request that I today submit it as an amendment to the pending bill on the floor of the Senate.

The amendment provides that no one shall be permitted to enter the United States as an immigrant in competition with our own American people if we have here unemployed 1,000,000 persons or more. So I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That no immigrant (as defined in section 203, title 8, U. S. Code) shall be admitted into the United States during any calendar year that the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more, such number of unemployed persons to be based upon statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that since the beginning of the present war more than 480,000 aliens had come into the United States. Some of them, of course, will return to their own countries. But I dare to say that a great number of those 480,000 will remain in the United States. I think we in America should have an opportunity to reappraise the entire situation. I think no one should be permitted to come into this country now as a permanent resident for at least 1 year after the war is over, in order that we may have an opportunity to study and reappraise the whole situation. Therefore, I offer an amendment in the nature

of a substitute for the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the benefit of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That after the date of enactment of this act, and until the expiration of 1 year after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, no immigration visa shall be issued to any immigrant.

SEC. 2. Terms defined in the Immigration Act of 1924 shall, when used in this act, have the meaning assigned to such terms in that act.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the suspension of immigration of aliens into the United States during the present war, and for other purposes."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at the proper time I should like to have the two amendments acted upon.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that it has been my understanding, based on the information I have received, that a majority of the Members of this body are going to vote for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law. I shall not ask for a record vote on the measure, but I simply have desired the opportunity to go on record to the effect that I oppose the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and that I oppose it because I say it will be the opening wedge. If we permit 105 Chinese, orientals, to come into the United States now it will in my opinion mean propaganda for further relaxation of our laws, and it will mean that in the years to come hundreds of thousands, persons aggregating into the millions, will pour into the United States in competition with the people of our country.

I simply wish to make my position clear on the record, and to state that I find no fault with the opinions held by my brothers here in the Senate who do not see eye to eye with me in the matter. Of course, I naturally dislike to be in the minority, but I have been in the minority so many times that it really does not have a great deal of effect upon me. I take the position I am now taking because it has been my position since I came to the Senate in 1932. I have opposed every bill offered in the Senate to open up the immigration gate, and I have done my best to aid others in defeating a number of bills which were before Congress to open up the American immigration gates, which would result in bringing more competition to American citizens than they have heretofore had.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute

submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity of being a member of the full committee and of the subcommittee which has considered this measure. I am heartily in accord with the conclusions which have been reached in regard to the matter, and I hope the bill will pass, and will pass now.

Just a moment ago it was suggested that if this bill passes possibly 105 Chinese might come into this country each year, and that it would be better for them to stay in Asia and to fight against our common enemy, the Japanese. It is possible that 105 Chinese might come into the United States in any one year, and it is also possible that all those 105 might be persons who would be eligible for military service in Asia; but even if that be so, those 105 are an infinitesimal number in comparison with the millions of men China has kept in the field in the present fight against oppression and against our totalitarian enemies who would conquer and enslave the world. Consequently, Mr. President, if the 105 Chinese should come in annually, I think that fact would be insignificant in comparison with the invaluable efforts which China is making in the interests of humanity.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], has made such a full statement in regard to the bill that I shall not attempt to elaborate upon it. However, I gladly take advantage of the present opportunity to pay tribute to the highly valuable and constructive part which has been played by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] in these deliberations and in the consideration of the bill. He is making a profound study of the subject of immigration, and I know that his assistance in working out such matters of legislation will continue to be very helpful.

The pending bill simply provides for the admission of 105 Chinese as a maximum, with certain other provisions as to naturalization and other subjects. There are many questions in regard to the subject of limitation of immigration which probably will come up for consideration a little later on. They should have, and I am sure they will receive, the most careful attention of the Senate at the time when they are presented. We cannot now foresee just what our general immigration policy should be, but certainly I should be opposed to opening the doors wide to immigration from any source whatever after the war.

The pending bill is really a much deserved token of our realization and appreciation of the splendid work China has been doing in the fight for freedom. The bill has convincing intrinsic merits. The bill is a very timely one, and I sincerely hope that the action of the Senate will be favorable in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, although I do not have the letter here—if I had I would ask to have it printed in the RECORD in its entirety—I promised the Episcopal bishop of the State of North Dakota to state on the floor of the Senate that he has endorsed the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H. R. 3070) was passed.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to revert to some remarks made a few days ago by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], to which I would have replied at the time if I had been on the floor. I was absent from the floor, at lunch, and I had no notice that during the discussion of an amendment to the Bankhead newspaper bill, which the Senator from North Dakota offered, being an amendment to include radios, he would divert his attention from that matter to a discussion of a personal nature concerning two estimable and eminent gentlemen from my State, which discussion I think was beside the question at the time before the Senate, and in which I think the Senator from North Dakota indulged in unfair personalities. I regret that I have delayed so long in referring to this matter; but, as I stated one day last week, the Senate adjourned from Tuesday, the 16th of November, until the following Thursday, and it was then that my attention was called to those remarks; and I went to the Senator from North Dakota about them, and told him I felt it my duty to call attention to them and to reply to some of the personal criticisms and aspersions which he had hurled at these two gentlemen, but that I wanted to let him know that I felt that way about the matter, so that he could be present. He asked me not to do so on that day, which was Thursday, and said that, if I would not do so, on the following Monday he would deliver an address to the Senate on the subject, that he would submit it to me in advance, and that he would assure me it would be satisfactory to me. So I agreed not to do anything about it until the following Monday.

In the meantime he asked me to mark the paragraphs to which I objected; and what he said about these two Kentuckians was so interspersed in each paragraph of his remarks that I marked all of them as being objectionable. Because of that, I suppose, the Senator refused to comply with his own suggestion that he would make amends or at least would make a satisfactory explanation, and would show it to me in advance.

In the midst of his discussion on the subject of the radio amendment which he had offered, the Senator from North Dakota said this:

I agree with what so many Senators who spoke yesterday said, that if we are to take care of the small newspapers we should also take care of the small radio stations. If we do not, I believe we shall be in the position indicated by an article which appeared the other day in the Washington Post, apropos of the Bankhead bill to place Government advertising in daily and weekly newspapers. The article was written by Drew Pearson. My judgment is that the most hated man in America today is former Congressman Fred Vinson who, Drew Pearson added, is hated by bankers, cattlemen, oilmen, farmers, railroad labor, and John L. Lewis.

I do not recall that that was an exact quotation from Mr. Pearson's article, which I read; and I do not think it is an exact quotation. Although I think the article Mr. Pearson wrote was on the whole intended to be complimentary to Judge Vinson, because of the courage he had displayed in the action he had taken since becoming Director of Economic Stabilization, I doubt very much if the quotation or reference to it by the Senator from North Dakota was intended to be a compliment.

Personally, I do not know whether Judge Vinson is the most hated man in America or not. I have great doubt about it. I have not taken a census of the American people to determine that; and, so far as I know, a Gallup poll has not been taken of the American people on the question whether Judge Vinson is the most hated man in America and on whether he is entitled to be placed in what the Senator from North Dakota says is a well-known list of Roosevelt haters and lovers. I do not know that Judge Vinson qualifies in either category. I am not certain that he is hated by any of those in the categories to which the Senator from North Dakota has referred; and even if he were, it would have no direct bearing upon his character or his integrity or his courage.

Mr. President, it is always easy for Members of the Senate or others to indulge in billingsgate with reference to anyone who may have done something which displeases them or which they do not like or of which they do not approve.

I have known Judge Vinson for many years. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1923, succeeding former Gov. William J. Fields, who resigned from the House of Representatives, in which he had represented what was then the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky, to become Governor of the State.

Prior to that time Judge Vinson had been commonwealth attorney in the district in which he lived. He served in the House of Representatives, almost without opposition, from 1923 until he resigned from that office, upon appointment to the bench by President Roosevelt, some 5 or 6 years ago.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] reminds me of the fact that in 1928, in the Hoover landslide, Judge Vinson was defeated, as were many others from the State of Kentucky and else-

where, and was out of the House for 2 years, but was reelected at the end of the 2-year term for which he was defeated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, that was largely due to the fact that Judge Vinson voluntarily left his own district and left the State in an effort to elect the Democratic nominee for President. For several months during that campaign he served as vice chairman of the regional headquarters at St. Louis, in the effort to elect the national ticket, and so neglected his own district.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. That is true. He was one of the important managers of the Democratic campaign for President in 1928—the famous Hoover-Smith campaign. He remained out of his own district practically during the whole time until the election, and as a result of his absence and his devotion to the larger phases of that campaign he was defeated; but that was a temporary defeat, because he was overwhelmingly elected at the end of that 2-year period.

In the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, in an effort to ridicule Judge Vinson, he stated that when he came to Congress he was quite ambitious, and that he desired to become a tax expert. I do not know that that is true; but even if it be true, I do not know that it is any discredit to a Member of the House of Representatives to try to learn something about the tax laws of the United States. God knows, there is a need for such knowledge, not only among Members of the House, but also Members of the Senate. If there is even now a man in the Senate or House of Representatives who can properly claim to be a tax expert, he is worth his weight in gold. The subject of taxation is one of the most difficult to understand and master, as members of the Finance Committee of the Senate and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House know, and as every Senator and every Member of the House knows.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Whether Judge Vinson came to Congress with the idea of becoming a tax expert or not, it is a matter of record that he did become a tax expert and was the outstanding tax expert in the House for several years before his resignation to accept a place on the bench. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Ways and Means Committee, and as such was the recognized tax expert in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. I might say also that members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House are elected by a majority of the votes on the Democratic side. I think that a similar situation is true also of the Republican side; but it has been true for many years that in the Democratic caucus members of the Ways and Means

Committee, which in addition to being the committee on taxation is also the committee on committees in the House and distributes all committee memberships for the majority, are elected.

Judge Vinson was elected by a majority of the members of his party to membership on the Ways and Means Committee and served on that committee for a number of years. He was a member of it at the time he resigned to accept appointment to the bench. He was so industrious and assiduous in his devotion to the duties of the position of member of the Ways and Means Committee that he really became, as the Senator from Missouri has said, the outstanding tax expert of the House. He was named as the chairman of the subcommittee on taxation of the House Ways and Means Committee, and played a very important, outstanding, and leading part in the framing of tax bills originating in the House under the provision of the Constitution which requires that they shall originate there.

He resigned that position after many years in the House when offered an appointment to the bench. I dare say that if he had not resigned from that position he would, in all likelihood, still be a Member of the House of Representatives, because he was very strong in his district. He was popular in all parts of the district, which, notwithstanding the aspersion cast at the district by referring to it as a district populated by people who still carry long guns—which is not an exact quotation from Drew Pearson's article, I will say—is one of the most cultured and refined districts in the State of Kentucky or any other State. It is largely an agricultural district. The largest city in that district is the city of Ashland, made up of about 35,000 people. Most of the other towns are typical county seats of agricultural counties.

In that district, in the city of Morehead, is located one of the State teachers' colleges. There are other educational institutions in the district. There is not a more typically American district in the United States than what was at one time the Ninth District and which is now, I believe, the Eighth District in Kentucky, due to a loss of membership under the last census.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is speaking of the culture of the district which Judge Vinson represented. It is a fact, is it not, that Judge Vinson himself is a graduate—and I believe an honor graduate—of one of the finest, oldest, and best small colleges in the United States; namely, Centre College?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. It is still one of the outstanding educational institutions of the State. Judge Vinson graduated with high honors and is still regarded by that institution as one of its outstanding graduates.

In the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota he said:

I do not need to bore the Senate with quotations about "the power to tax is the power to destroy"—

He is referring to Judge Vinson as a tax expert—
but underlying that ambition—

This is the thing to which I object—is a deeper desire, a desire to secure unlimited power without electoral responsibility.

I suppose the same thing might be said, if one wished to draw on his imagination, of any Member of either the House or Senate who became a member of the taxing committee. It would be just as true to say of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] or of myself, or of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], or any other Senator who is a member of the Finance Committee, that we connived at our own appointment to membership on that committee in order that we might gratify a deeper underlying desire "to secure unlimited power without electoral responsibility." No man can become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or of the Finance Committee of the Senate without electoral responsibility. He must be elected to one House or the other in order to be eligible for appointment as a member of either of those committees.

The Senator from North Dakota further stated:

So now we have Mr. Vinson as the Price and Wage Stabilizer, and he admits freely to arousing the enmity of the farmer, the worker, the oil, the banking, the mining, and the cattle interests of the Nation.

That is the first time I have heard from anyone's lips or pen that Judge Vinson freely admits having aroused the enmity of those groups. I am quite certain that he has not said anything of the kind, and I do not think anyone else, aside from the Senator from North Dakota, has said anything like that about him. Certainly Drew Pearson did not say that he freely admitted having aroused the enmity of those gentlemen.

Yet if any Member of the Senate were to arouse the hatred of so many groups, he could not possibly return to the Senate.

That is a speculative remark concerning which no one can offer any proof. No Senator ever knows, no matter of what committee he may be a Member, and no Member of the House ever knows whether, after he casts a vote on any subject, he will or will not be reelected to the Senate or the House of Representatives.

I digress long enough to say that it is a poor Representative indeed who, every time he casts a vote upon any great question, has his eyes focused upon the next election. I should dislike to think that all the Members of the United States Senate and all the Members of the House of Representatives, however human we are in our approach to questions, have regard only for the effect upon our reelection to one body or the other.

Mr. President, I wish to say just this about Judge Vinson: No man in public life, or who has been in public life, has enjoyed and now enjoys a greater respect among those who know him and those who have associated with him than does Fred Vinson.

I have not always agreed with Mr. Vinson in matters of legislation. Although he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee and I a member of the Finance Committee, both of us being from the same State, I did not always agree with him in regard to the theory of taxation. I did not hesitate to express my views upon questions of taxation as they appealed to me. I did not expect Judge Vinson to hesitate to express his views in regard to the theory of taxation. Sometimes when he was a conferee on the part of the House and I was a conferee on the part of the Senate, meeting day by day to resolve the differences between the two Houses on questions of taxation, I found myself in disagreement with him, but that did not thereby lessen my respect for him. It did not thereby reduce my regard for his integrity, his honesty, his sincerity, or his courage.

Whatever one may say about Judge Vinson, no one can attack his sincerity or integrity, and certainly not his courage. He did not seek the position which he now holds under appointment by the President of the United States. He was asked by the President to accept it, just as Mr. Justice Byrnes was asked to accept the same appointment, which involved his resignation from the Supreme Court of the United States, a position which I know Justice Byrnes desired, and which he felt highly honored in receiving. But when the President asked him to give up that secure, lifetime tenure in order to do a job for the Government of the United States and the people of the United States in one of our great emergencies, he surrendered that lifetime position and accepted the responsibility as Director of Economic Stabilization. When the President reorganized that agency and made Mr. Justice Byrnes Director of the War Mobilization Agency, the position to which he had been appointed and for which he resigned from the bench was left vacant, and the President asked Judge Vinson to accept that place.

I have never been called upon to settle a question of that sort in my own mind, but I believe that when a man has a dignified, honorable, and lifetime position on the Federal bench and is asked by the President of the United States, or anyone else, to surrender that position in order to accept a temporary appointment of any kind, it places before him a very delicate and perhaps in some cases an embarrassing situation.

Neither Justice Byrnes nor Judge Vinson hesitated for a moment. While neither of them sought the position to which he was appointed, neither of them hesitated when he was called upon to decide whether to render a service to his country in a position that was bound to be temporary or remain in a safe berth on the bench of the United States. Neither of them hesitated to surrender his position on the bench and accept the appointment which was tendered to him by the President of the United States.

While I have disagreed with Judge Vinson, as I have already indicated, and may find myself in disagreement with him in regard to some matters upon

which he has been called to decide as Director of Economic Stabilization, I respect him as a man and as a public servant. I respect him for his honesty, his dignity, and his courage. I am proud to give testimony, if it is needed, in that regard. The only reason that I feel justified in taking the time of the Senate to talk about this matter is that what the Senator from North Dakota has said on the subject is already in the temporary RECORD of the Congress and will be in the permanent RECORD which will be handed down and read by generations yet to come. I am unwilling for the permanent RECORD to go down to future generations without some reply to what I think was an unfair attack upon Judge Vinson in the speech made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has already said, much better than I could, what I desired to say. Whether or not anyone agrees with the actions taken by Justice Byrnes and by Judge Vinson in their official positions—and I have disagreed with both of them at times and expect to disagree with both of them in the future—no one but an idiot could possibly question the high motives and the high patriotism of men who, after long and distinguished public careers, had come to judicial positions, and who gave them up under the sole impulse of serving their country in this great emergency. As I say, no one except an idiot, it seems to me, could possibly attack the high courage of those men in the course which they are pursuing. Perhaps they are mistaken, but I am certain that everyone agrees that they are bringing to bear upon their particular positions the best intelligence which their high character and intellect give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Missouri has said, and of course it is abundantly true. I might also add, as I have indicated a moment ago, that I have disagreed with them. I find myself in disagreement now with some of the things which have been done under the Economic Stabilization Agency, but that does not make it necessary for me to doubt the integrity or honesty or good faith of men who have been responsible for those actions.

For a long time I have been on terms of intimacy and friendship with some of those involved in the decisions which have been made, and I am in position to say that while one or two of the decisions rendered by Judge Vinson and Justice Byrnes do not meet the approval of large numbers of men in this country, even they have a high regard for the integrity, honesty, and courage of both of these public servants.

In his remarks the Senator from North Dakota went out of his way also to attack a young man who is in the office of Judge Vinson at the present time, but who was not originally appointed by him. The Senator referred rather sarcastically and in an effort at ridicule to Mr. Edward Pritchard, who happens to be a young

man from the State of Kentucky. I think this young man is one of the most brilliant men with whom it has ever been my privilege to come in contact.

Before I ever knew him I had a conversation which I recall with the late Senator from Illinois, Hon. James Hamilton Lewis, who was on his way to Europe in the summer of 1936 or 1937—I have forgotten which. When Senator Lewis returned he said to me, "On my way over I came in contact with a young man who was on his way to England. He had been appointed a Rhodes scholar. I should like to know if you know him." I said, "I do not know. Who was he?" The Senator replied, "His name is Edward Pritchard." I said, "I do not know young Pritchard. I know his father." His father was a State Senator in Kentucky. He was an honorable man and served in the State Senate of Kentucky with distinction to himself and credit to his district.

Young Pritchard was a graduate of Princeton University. Following his graduation from Princeton University he was appointed as a Rhodes scholar. We all know how Rhodes scholarships are awarded. Pritchard was not appointed because of any political pull. I do not believe political pull could bring such an appointment about. He was appointed as a Rhodes scholar because of his outstanding record as a student in Princeton University. He went to Oxford, I believe, and completed his studies under his appointment as a Rhodes scholar.

He returned home and entered the Harvard Law School, of which the present Justice Felix Frankfurter was dean. The Senator from North Dakota seems to cast some aspersion on young Pritchard because he fell under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, who was then dean of the Harvard Law School. I suppose the only way any young American who desired to study law at Harvard could avoid coming under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, then Dean Frankfurter, was to go to some other school. Justice Frankfurter was then dean of the Harvard Law School. The Harvard Law School was probably as popular, as widely known, and as highly favored as the law school of any other university in the United States.

Young Pritchard was a student under Dean Frankfurter at Harvard Law School. He graduated from that law school with high honors. About that time Dean Frankfurter was appointed to the Supreme Court. Justice Holmes and other justices followed the practice of bringing outstanding graduates of the law school to Washington and giving them positions as clerks for a year. I recall many who are now outstanding lawyers in this country who were brought to Washington by Justice Holmes and made his law clerk for a period of a year. Afterward they entered the practice of law. Of course, they regarded it as a very valuable experience. I think that any young lawyer would regard it as a very valuable experience to be law clerk to a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Following that example, and knowing Mr. Pritchard, Justice Frankfurter brought him to Washington and appointed him as his clerk for a year. He went from there into various branches of the Government service. He was not appointed by Justice Vinson to the position which he now holds. He was appointed to that position by Justice Byrnes. I do not recall what other place young Pritchard occupied in the legal departments of Washington prior to his appointment by Justice Byrnes as one of his employees while he himself was the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Before Justice Byrnes was made Director of War Mobilization, young Pritchard joined the Army of the United States. I do not know how he got into the Army in the first place. He is greatly overweight. Anyone who has seen young Pritchard knows that he is a very heavy young man for his age. He is greatly overweight. However, he joined the Army because of a desire to render some service in a military capacity. I think the truth is that the Army found it could not train him down to the proper proportions, and it relieved him of service in the Army with an honorable discharge. Pritchard went back to the position which he had held under Justice Byrnes prior to entering the Army.

The Senator from North Dakota has referred to this young man as Judge Vinson's alter ego. I think it is fair to say that Judge Vinson has no alter ego. He is his own man in his own right. I have no doubt that when the Army honorably discharged young Pritchard for the reasons which I have already indicated, and he went back to the position which he had forsaken when he went into the Army, Judge Vinson, who in the meantime had taken over the position previously held by Justice Byrnes, was glad to reinstate Pritchard in the position which he had formerly occupied. I presume that the fact that Judge Vinson had been a schoolmate, although not a classmate, of young Pritchard's father in years past would not militate against his reinstatement in that position; and no invidious distinctions or inferences are to be drawn from the fact that when he came back to his office and found Judge Vinson as the head of the agency, he resumed his duties in that position.

Mr. President, I think it extremely unfair to men who cannot answer for themselves on this floor, or elsewhere, so far as that is concerned, to refer to them as this young man's honorable father has been referred to, as "Old Pritch," and this young man himself as "Young Pritch." That may be in accordance with the logic of events and of senatorial debate and discussion, but I hardly think it is up to senatorial standards.

In the course of his remarks the Senator proceeded to say that "Young Pritch" was never even elected dog catcher. I suppose that is true. Neither was the Senator from North Dakota ever elected dog catcher. I am not even going to say that an atmosphere of such a position as that would find congeniality for the Senator from North Dakota.

None of us here has been elected dog catcher, and if that is a disqualification for rendering important service to the United States, all of us should resign and go back home and run for dog catcher, in order to qualify for membership in the Senate of the United States, or to some other responsible position to which we might aspire.

Mr. President, it is a source of great regret to me that I find it necessary to take the time of the Senate and discuss this matter, but I do it, as I stated, because I am unwilling for the permanent RECORD of the debates of the Senate of the United States to be handed down to generations yet to come with no reference by me, one who has known both these men for many years, in both of whom I have the utmost confidence as to their integrity, their honesty, their good faith and their patriotism, and the courage they manifest in doing things which are unpopular, and which they probably know in advance will be unpopular when they do them.

We can disagree with men without aspersing their character or their honor. Under the rules of the Senate we are not allowed to say anything about Members of the Senate which would be in any way an attack upon their character or their integrity. However, there is no rule which binds us in the same regard with reference to men outside this body who have no opportunity to defend themselves or to speak up when they are attacked.

I am happy and I am proud to have been able to say these things about Judge Vinson and about young Edward Pritchard. I am sure that, regardless of any one's views as to their official actions, those who know them will agree that what I have said about them is true.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a Senator sitting near me says that I neglected to state, in the course of my remarks, what the late Senator James Hamilton Lewis said about young Mr. Pritchard. I thought I had quoted Senator Lewis. When he returned from Europe, having traveled on the same ship with young Mr. Pritchard, he sought me out to tell me that he found him one of the most brilliant young men with whom he had ever come in contact in all his travels and all his experience. I am sure that every one who has known young Mr. Pritchard will confirm what the late Senator Lewis said about him.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to call the attention of my fellow Senators to the fact that nowhere in the entire talk of mine which has been quoted did I attack the honesty or integrity of Mr. Vinson. The record speaks for itself.

The distinguished Senator said a moment ago that upon the Senate floor one may not attack the character of another Senator, and that, I am glad to say, is true; but the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is now trying to extend the rule and, apparently, he does not want me to attack a single employee of the President of the United States.

The Senator says there was not anything said by Mr. Drew Pearson about Mr. Vinson being "the most hated man in America." I have in my hand Mr. Drew Pearson's article.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield until I get through. I did not interrupt the Senator, and I should rather he did not interrupt me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said—

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield, and he has a right to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I hold in my hand the article in question, and the very heading of it reads:

Drew Pearson today awards the brass ring and a free ride on the Washington Merry-Go-Round to "the most hated man in Washington"—Judge Fred M. Vinson.

That is the heading.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has been quoting me—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Pearson proceeds to say in his article, which apparently the Senator from Kentucky never read:

He has rowed with the farmers, he has earned the undying enmity of railroad labor, he has fought the big oil companies, he has the cattlemen swearing vengeance against him, he has stamped on the toes of John L. Lewis, he has even taken on Harold Ickes.

I did not mention Harold Ickes in my speech. Mr. Drew Pearson goes further and says:

In this particular fight, Vinson was bucking the big oil companies and the entire oil industry. In another fight, however, he was bucking the coal miners and took just as adamant a stand against John L. Lewis.

Then he proceeds to say in another place—and let Senators decide whether he said this man was hated:

The most hated man in the United States of America, as far as railroad labor is concerned, is Fred Vinson. Some rail workers actually think that Vinson must have been paid by the railroad executives to block their demand for a wage increase.

Then, coming to the matter of guns in Kentucky, at which the distinguished Senator seems to have taken very great offense, this is what Mr. Pearson says:

Louisa, Judge Vinson's birthplace, is up in the Kentucky mountains where some people still carry guns, and where some of the judge's friends, in all seriousness, have promised to bring their Winchester to Washington if he gets in trouble.

With reference to the remarks of the distinguished Senator about Mr. Vinson being a leading tax expert, and nothing being said in the article about that, Mr. Pearson says in the statement that Mr. Vinson "soon became a leading tax legislator."

Again referring to the matter of hatred, Mr. Pearson says:

Though it hasn't been featured in the papers, Vinson is hated by the big cattle ranchers, even more by railroad men.

The very last paragraph states, in conclusion, as the Senator would have known if he had read the article:

Vinson feels what he says, lives it, practices it; and, though he may be hated by bankers, cattlemen, oilmen, railroad labor, and John L. Lewis, it will take the President of the United States himself to overrule Fred Vinson.

Mr. President, apparently the distinguished Senator did not read the speech I made on November 12, a few days previous to the one to which he takes objection, so I call his attention to page 9449 of the RECORD.

Of course a great many Senators upon the floor have known me only from the time I came into the Senate, but when I was a boy, when I was out working for a neighbor farmer for a few dollars a month, when I was raised on a little place out in North Dakota, I learned that poor people most of the time have not very many friends. When I got to be about 16 years of age, a neighbor farmer of my father's hired me, even in those tender years, to become foreman of his place and operate it, with a great big crew, on one of those big farms in North Dakota. In those days migratory labor was called by the inappropriate name of "hobos" and "I. W. W.'s."

Mr. President, those men 30 years ago would get out at 4 o'clock or 4:30 in the morning, and they would work until late at night, for \$1 a day, or one dollar and a half a day, or two or two and a half dollars a day. Some of those workers came from the great State of Kentucky, as they came from a great many other States. I became acquainted with many of them. When it rained they played poker. I saw those men fight when they had their disagreements, and I got to be a very good friend with many of them.

Later in life I met many railroad men. Mr. President, I say that the treatment these million laboring railroad men in America have received at the hands of the President is a disgrace to the country. It brings me back to the speech I made on the 12th day of November because—and examine that RECORD—I said then:

During 1942 the railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger business in history, and the business has climbed to still higher levels during the present year. In 1942, revenue freight ton-miles were almost 50 percent greater than in the pre-war peak year of 1929, and passenger business was almost double that of 1929.

Further on I said:

In spite of the fact that the railroads entered upon the war period with a plant that had suffered from 10 years of business, and from 10 years of subnormal maintenance, they handled, in 1942, about 50 percent more freight business and almost 100 percent more passenger business with about 24 percent fewer employees.

I went on to say, Mr. President:

While the total railroad wage bill in 1942 was only \$36,000,000 above that of 1929, the operating revenues of the railroads increased by \$1,187,000,000 over 1929. This meant that while 46 cents out of each revenue dollar went for wages in 1929, only 39 cents went for wages in 1942.

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee—

I call particular attention of Senators to this language:

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee increased from 269,000 to 502,000, which was an increase in transportation output per employee of almost 100 percent.

Then I proceeded to state:

It was on the basis of this increased labor output, this new peak record of labor efficiency, and these higher operating revenues and higher net profits, which were realized without proportionately higher operating expenses, that the Board—

The Board, mind you, Mr. President, set up by law—

the Board found after 44 days of exhaustive public hearings that the 8-cent hourly increase was warranted by the facts, was justified under the stabilization program, could be met by the railroads without any increase in freight and passenger rates, and was necessary as an aid to the effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, although the increase was agreed to by the railroads, although it was agreed to by over a million railroad men, Mr. Vinson set it aside. I have before me the order in which Mr. Vinson set it aside:

In February of this year an emergency board was appointed, under the Railway Mediation Act and Presidential Executive orders, to consider the wage rates of the million nonoperating railway employees. That board, after weeks of hearings and consideration of hundreds of statistical exhibits on wage conditions, reported that the wages of these railway men are far below those of workers in comparable occupations in other industries. On 20 specific occupations there were only 3 where the railway workers are paid more than the lowest outside rates; in 10 of the occupations the lowest outside rate was at least 10 cents an hour above the railroad rate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete speech which I made on the subject of railroad labor's magnificent war record on November 12, 1943, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD LABOR'S MAGNIFICENT WAR RECORD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the magnificent record of railroad labor that has so frequently been praised in the Halls of Congress was again recognized by the President's Emergency Board in its report to the President on May 24 with respect to the railroad-wage dispute which has now reached the proportions of a railroad crisis.

Following its comprehensive investigations conducted March 1 to May 7, the Board found that the record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificent one. In this connection, the Board informed the President that—

"This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. * * * The labor force of the railroads has encouraged and supported every reasonable effort in these directions, has increasingly adjusted its working habits and arrangements to the needs of the emergency situation, and has used its skill and industry without stint in the interest of attaining these objectives. Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men. Without free and complete and whole-hearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificent record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved."

It is a most regrettable fact and a matter of grave national concern to find now that this splendid achievement in our Nation's vital transportation industry is being seriously impaired, even dangerously menaced, in this critical stage of our war activities, by the refusal of the Stabilization Director to approve the wage compromise recommended by the President's fact-finding body after such thorough and exhaustive investigations.

The remarkable record of labor productivity in the railroad industry has long been known to the Members of Congress. The long and unbroken record of harmonious industrial relations growing out of the high type of labor leadership in this industry has invoked unstinted praise upon the part of Congress on many occasions. The Railway Labor Act, when permitted to function without interference, has been universally recognized as the most satisfactory labor legislation ever enacted by Congress. In short, the labor productivity, labor harmony, and labor leadership in the railroad industry have long been the ideal that Congress has hoped for in the Nation's industries as a whole.

During 1942 the railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger business in history, and the business has climbed to still higher levels during the present year. In 1942, revenue freight ton-miles were almost 50 percent greater than in the pre-war peak year of 1929, and passenger business was almost double that of 1929.

Due to the economies and deferred purchases which resulted from the 10 subnormal years following 1929, the railroads were called upon unexpectedly to meet these new and staggering war demands with fewer locomotives, fewer freight cars, fewer passenger cars, and with an accumulation of deferred maintenance in both roadway and equipment. The situation was made more difficult due to the fact that material shortages and war restrictions prevented the immediate replacements and rehabilitation of the plant that would otherwise have been made when the tremendously increased war revenues began rolling into the cash drawers of the railroad industries.

But as a result of these war restrictions, the job had to be done by greater effort on the part of management and men with a very limited amount of additional equipment.

Fortunately for the war effort and for the national well-being, it was done and on a magnificent basis. The tremendous contribution made by railroad labor is strikingly shown in the fact that the 1942 peak transportation job was handled by only 1,271,000 employees, which was 390,000 fewer than were employed in 1929 when the earlier peak business was handled by the railroads without the emergencies and the other factors incident to the war transportation job handled in 1942. Fewer men handled a bigger job with less equipment and under more difficult circumstances during the year 1942.

In spite of the fact that the railroads entered upon the war period with a plant that

had suffered from 10 lean years of business, and from 10 years of subnormal maintenance, they handled, in 1942, about 50 percent more freight business and almost 100 percent more passenger business with about 24 percent fewer employees.

In the case of the railroad industry and its million and a quarter trained workers, the first critical year of our Nation's war effort was not another unhappy instance of "too little, too late." On the contrary, a greatly reduced number of workers, working with a railroad plant that had suffered from 10 years of undermaintenance, turned out the greatest transportation job in world history and made new records in labor efficiency and productivity.

While the total railroad wage bill in 1942 was only \$36,000,000 above that of 1929, the operating revenues of the railroads increased by \$1,187,000,000 over 1929. This meant that while 46 cents out of each revenue dollar went for wages in 1929, only 39 cents went for wages in 1942.

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee increased from 269,000 to 502,000, which was an increase in transportation output per employee of almost 100 percent.

As a result of this remarkable job by railroad labor, the President's emergency board was able to report to the President that, for the year 1942, the operating ratio—the ratio of operating expenses to operating revenues, frequently used as a measure of efficient and profitable railroad business—was more favorable in 1942 than for any other year on record.

It is also true that the 1942 wage ratio, that is to say, the relation of total wages to total operating revenues, also reached a new low when it dropped to the unprecedented ratio of 39.3.

As a result of the record business handled in 1942 with a reduced number of workers, the operating revenues climbed to fantastic peaks. Never before had total operating revenues reached the \$7,000,000,000 figure. In the earlier peak year of 1929 they had soared to \$6,279,000,000. However, in 1942 they reached the astronomic figure of \$7,466,000,000.

This tremendous increase in total operating revenues was not accompanied by a proportionate increase in total operating expenses nor in total wages. As a result of this, the net railway operating income for 1942 climbed to the new high peak of \$1,480,940,000.

It was on the basis of this increased labor output, this new peak record of labor efficiency, and these higher operating revenues and higher net profits, which were realized without proportionately higher operating expenses that the Board found after 44 days of exhaustive public hearings that the 8-cent hourly increase was warranted by the facts, was justified under the stabilization program, could be met by the railroads without any increase in freight and passenger rates, and was necessary as an aid to the effective prosecution of the war.

The Board, in reporting to the President on May 29, summed all this up very concisely when it said, on page 98 of its printed report:

"A careful study and analysis of the entire record leads to the conclusion that the correcting of gross inequities requires the recommended wage increases for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees. The increases constitute the minimum adjustments necessary for this purpose. The addition to the wage bill of the railroad industry will not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in these rates. The recommended increases are within the existing general levels of production costs in the sense that they

do not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for increases in production costs in comparable industries and employments. The correction, by means of the recommended increases, of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the maintenance of the railroad industry in a position that will enable it to aid most effectively in the prosecution of the war."

In the light of these findings on the part of the President's fact-finding board, it strikes me that the Stabilization Director in his arbitrary cancellation of this 8-cent hourly increase, has failed to do the job that he was appointed to do, which is to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, and that he has through his rigid determination to freeze wages actually impaired the war effort.

The crisis in railway labor relations has arisen only because a wage increase found by a Presidential emergency board to be "necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war" has been summarily vetoed by Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson. If the Presidential board, composed of experts in the railway labor field, is right, then Judge Vinson has taken a stand which prevents maximum effectiveness in our war effort.

This conflict between Government agencies demands immediate attention. The importance of American railroads in our war production jobs certainly needs no proof. These railroads are not only hauling raw materials—the ore, the lumber, the agricultural products—required to keep the war machine rolling, but they also haul the parts of the semifinished products which must arrive in tremendous volume and on close schedules at every vital assembly and production plant. The finished war materials must get to our seaboard to fit the schedules of overseas transportation. Not just the need for a great total volume of transportation, but also the imperative requirement for efficient and timely transportation of all of our war products rests squarely upon these American railroads.

Before the war emergency, railway staffs were at a minimum level; to meet the demands of the emergency, the railroads have had to increase their forces by over 400,000 men. Railway transportation, furthermore, is not only a matter of the number of men and women working for the carriers, but it is also a matter of having enough employees with the necessary skill and experience to provide safe as well as continuous operation of our great railway systems.

To recruit this new army of railway workers and to hold the skilled men already working for the railroads, it is elementary common sense that the railroads must pay wages comparing with some degree of justice to those offered skilled workers in other industries. As a matter of fact, however, railroad wages are and have been far below those paid to similar skills in other industries.

In February of this year an emergency board was appointed, under the Railway Mediation Act and Presidential Executive orders, to consider the wage rates of the million non-operating railway employees. That Board, after weeks of hearings and consideration of hundreds of statistical exhibits on wage conditions, reported that the wages of these railway men are far below those of workers in comparable occupations in other industries. On 20 specific occupations there were only 3 where the railway workers are paid more than the lowest outside rates; in 10 of the occupations the lowest outside rate was at least 10 cents an hour above the railroad rate. The top rates, in some cases, in outside industries were as much as \$1 an hour above railway rates.

It takes no profound knowledge of economic or of human nature to know what has happened under those circumstances. Many thousands of skilled railway workers

have gone into other employment. New workers entering railway service for the first time have speedily decided to go into other employment. The Railroad Retirement Board reported that in the year ending July 1, 1943, 1,300,000 employees were hired by the railroads, but 1,210,000 employees were lost. For every 13 men who went to work for the carriers 12 men quit and went elsewhere.

This tremendous turn-over of railway workers is a serious and devastating loss to the railway industry, but it is much more than that. Such a shift in employment is a net loss of major proportions to the total manpower resources of the Nation. The new railway worker, during his first weeks of service, is of little value. Moreover, the training he is being given takes the time of older workers and of railway supervisors, and his lack of skill endangers all his fellow employees. When that new worker, after complete or only partial training, leaves the railroad and goes into other industries, the Nation has lost the man-days or weeks of his own training, as well as the hours of effort expended by older employees and supervisors in that training. Much of this training on the railroad is utterly and completely valueless in any other industry.

That situation is what called forth the recommendation of the Emergency Board, appointed under the Railway Labor Act, that the wages of these railway men should be increased by 8 cents an hour. The Director of Economic Stabilization, in vetoing that wage increase, has made certain that there will be a continuance of manpower shortage on the railroads. He has made certain that there will be a continuance of the excessive turn-over. He has guaranteed the continuance of the terrific losses to our inadequate manpower pool that the turn-over in the railway industry has caused. This act by Judge Vinson seems clearly in defiance of the Stabilization Act passed by Congress on October 2, 1942. The Congress has directed the administration so to adjust wages as to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. The administration has before it the decision by a competent board of experts that this wage increase is a war necessity. Judge Vinson, in setting aside this recommendation, has thus violated the clear mandates of the Congress, and has placed a major obstacle in the way of the rapid and successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. President, I make these remarks firm in the knowledge that the public at large has not had made available to it by the public press the true facts which are back of the present effort on the part of the railroad workers to have placed clearly before the people the demands which they make in connection with which a strike vote is now being taken. I deplore the strike vote. I am sorry it had to be taken; but in my judgment I do not know of anything else that the million men laboring upon the railroads could do.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Vinson is not giving the railroad men a square deal at the present time. The newspapers only yesterday said that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] himself went to the President within the last few days in an endeavor to see whether he could not do something about it.

Mr. President, while I was still upon the prairies of North Dakota, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was a representative from the State of Kentucky. I heard then about this fighting champion of the common people of the State of Kentucky, and naturally I assumed when I came to the Senate that, regardless of friendship, if he found that

the President was using someone for a stooge, he would get up and say so.

I say that in this case the President of the United States is not giving the railroad men a square deal, is simply using Fred Vinson, because the record itself shows that one time these railroad men went to the White House and they had made an agreement with the President of the United States, and when they went back at a later date they claim that he would not go through with that deal.

Mr. President, I have before me strong authority. I have here an article published in the Machinist's Monthly Journal. The International Association of Machinists is an organization with a membership of over 600,000. In the Journal is to be found an article—written by whom? It is by General Vice President Eric Peterson. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point, because it corroborates what I have said with respect to the trouble these men have had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

A RARE AND UNUSUAL CASE

(By General Vice President Eric Peterson)

In spite of protestations to the contrary an economic dictatorship in this country is now an established fact; at least, as far as control over wage rates is concerned. Any doubt that may have existed regarding the absolute power vested in the Director of Economic Stabilization to veto wage increases was erased when the President issued an Executive order October 16, 1943, establishing a Special Emergency Board to report on the claims for wage adjustments of nonoperating railway employees.

Until that order was issued there was some reason to believe that adjustment of wage disputes in the railroad industry was still governed by the Railway Labor Act—legislation responsible for a 20-year record of peaceful labor relations in one of the Nation's most vital industries.

The extraordinary patience displayed by the Nation's railway employees during the 13 months of their request for a wage increase which has been considered by one Government agency after another, has been nothing short of amazing compared with the reaction of workers in other industries when experiencing inexcusable delays in adjustment of wage disputes.

And what is the reward for such patience and efficient and uninterrupted service?

A denial of economic justice.

That is what the President's Executive order of October 16 amounts to. That order is tantamount to a scrapping of the Railway Labor Act, as it relegates members of the Special Emergency Board to the role of puppets.

Of what use is it to appoint another Board to consider the merits of a dispute already passed on by a tribunal which reported its findings after 44 days of hearings, when the Board is specifically directed to make recommendations in conformity with the opinion of the Economic Stabilization Director?

Of what meaning is the language that "the recommendations of the Special Emergency Board in regard to proposed changes shall become effective 15 days after the date of the filing of its report to the President," when it is coupled with the phrase, "unless and except to the extent the Economic Stabilization Director otherwise directs."

Why go through the motions of appointing another board when its members are not free agents?

Why not dispense with the window dressing and bluntly tell the railway employees that the rights guaranteed them under the Railway Labor Act have been junked, and that the whims and theories of one man now rule their economic destiny?

In his opinion of June 30, 1943, the economic dictator blocked the insufficient wage increase of 8 cents per hour recommended by the Emergency Board appointed February 20, 1943, and in so doing completely disregarded the effect its edict would have on the effective prosecution of the war.

He substituted theory for reality when he refused to approve the agreement of August 7, 1943, negotiated with the carriers by the 15 nonoperating organizations.

No amount of theorizing by the director can nullify the following factual statement appearing in the letter addressed July 3, 1943, to the Economic Stabilization Director by Chairman J. L. Sharfman, Railroad Emergency Board:

"The Emergency Board recommended to the President what it deemed to be a fair and reasonable settlement of the dispute, after giving full weight to the requirements of the stabilization program and its authority under that program. On the record before the Board there is not justification for modifying its recommendations. The complete alternation of the basis of settlement suggested in your memorandum opinion would not only result in the perpetuation of gross inequities, as well as in the creation of new ones, but it would remove the adjustment of railway labor disputes from the agencies established by the Railway Labor Act and would thereby jeopardize the procedure and machinery of that act. There is real danger that such an outcome and such an approach would gravely impair the effective prosecution of the war."

In his disapproval of the recommended wage increase the dictator chose to ignore the right of the Board to grant increase in "rare and unusual cases in which the critical needs of war production require the setting of a wage at some point above the minimum of the going wage bracket."

He didn't find it difficult to approve wage increases in excess of the Little Steel formula for the lumber industry of Michigan and Wisconsin, and again in the aircraft industry when the N. W. L. B. on September 24, 1943, after a presentation made by the International Association of Machinists, established for the Boeing plants in the State of Washington a top rate of \$1.60 for tool and die makers and a starting rate of 82½ cents per hour for unskilled help, retroactive to March 3, 1943.

The following significant statement appears in the written opinion filed by Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman, N. W. L. B., in support of the Board's award in the Boeing case:

"Boeing's chief worry in holding the relatively large numbers falling within the key classifications of labor grade V stems, however, from the employment opportunities offered to the thousands of workers by the shipbuilding yards within the Seattle area. There the minimum rate for most of the comparable occupational classifications is \$1.20 per hour, with maximums for blacksmiths, burners, electricians, joiners, machinists, machine operators, sheet metal workers, welders, and others ranging upward to \$1.38 and \$1.46, and sometimes to \$1.50 or more.

"In the face of these employment opportunities, it will not, in our opinion, solve the special problem that now confronts us, to fix Boeing grade V at the shipyard minimum of \$1.20. A rate in excess of \$1.20 must be approved if the Boeing workers are to be

expected to remain at their jobs and increase their efficiency in these key classifications, rather than turn to outside shops or the shipyards at higher wages."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Forgotten Man," written by William Graham Sumner in 1883, and which is recommended reading for Labor Day, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Now who is the Forgotten Man? He is the simple, honest laborer, ready to earn his living by productive work. We pass him by because he is independent, self-supporting, and asks no favors. He does not appeal to the emotions or excite the sentiments. He only wants to make a contract and fulfill it, with respect on both sides and favor on neither side.

He is the clean, quiet, virtuous, domestic citizen, who pays his debts and his taxes and is never heard of out of his little circle. Yet who is there in the society of a civilized state who deserves to be remembered and considered by the legislator and statesman before this man?

The Forgotten Man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

Such is the forgotten man. He works, he votes, generally he prays; but he always pays; yes, above all, he pays. He does not want an office; his name never gets into the newspaper except when he gets married or dies. He keeps production going on. He contributes to the strength of parties. He is flattered before election. He is strongly patriotic. He is wanted whenever, in his little circle, there is work to be done or counsel to be given. He may grumble some occasionally to his wife and family, but he does not frequent the grocery or talk politics at the tavern. Consequently, he is forgotten. He is a commonplace man. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero (like a popular orator), or a problem (like tramps and outcasts), nor notorious (like criminals), nor an object of sentiment (like the poor and weak), nor a burden (like paupers and loafers), nor an object out of which social capital may be made (like the beneficiaries of church and State charities), nor an object for charitable aid and protection (like animals treated with cruelty), nor the object of a job (like the ignorant and illiterate), nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments (like inefficient workmen and shiftless artisans). Therefore, he is forgotten. All the burdens fall on him, or on her, for it is time to remember that the forgotten man is not seldom a woman.

It is plain enough that the forgotten man and the forgotten woman are the very life and substance of society. They are the ones who ought to be first and always remembered. They are always forgotten by sentimentalists, philanthropists, reformers, enthusiasts, and every description of speculator in sociology, political economy, or political science. If a student of any of these sciences ever comes to understand the position of the forgotten man and to appreciate his true value, you will find such student an uncompromising advocate of the strictest scientific thinking on all social topics, and a cold and hard-hearted skeptic toward all artificial schemes of social amelioration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me the cover page of the American Federationist, the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor, William Green, editor. If the distinguished Senator from Kentucky thinks I am ridiculing Mr. Vinson, I suggest that he read the cover page of this magazine, in which William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, talks about Mr. Vinson's assertion that there has been but a 12-percent increase in the cost of living. Every farmer knows better. Every Senator upon this floor knows of scores and scores of items in which the increase in price has been more than doubled. I ask that the article on the cover page of the American Federationist entitled "Vinson's 12 Percent" may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VINSON'S 12 PERCENT

The statement from Mr. Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, that a measure of success has been achieved in the effort to hold prices in this war at lower levels than they reached during the first 19 months of the corresponding period of World War No. 1 is undoubtedly true. Under Mr. Herbert Hoover's food price stabilization effort, for instance, eggs rose to \$1.25 a dozen, and many will remember how such items as sugar soared.

With Mr. Vinson's assertion that prices have risen but 12 percent since Pearl Harbor, however, there is bound to be dissent. If Mr. Vinson has taken the whole price scale of all economic commodities as his guide, the guide is meaningless. A huge range of items are no longer obtainable and are not being bought by the ordinary mass of consumers at all.

Food, shelter, clothes and fuel are the major items of the working family budget in this country. Prices of food, as every housewife in New England knows, have risen in many instances between 200 and 300 percent. Eggs, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, apples, fruit generally, preserves, fish, vegetables, and many meats are selling at double what they sold for 19 months ago.

Food is the major headache of the average household. It does no good to attempt to tell those who buy it fairy tales about what they are paying, nor does it butter any parsnips to pretend that this matter of food prices can be comfortably buried in any total national price average and still have valid meaning.

True, rents have been frozen in many areas. In many they have not. Clothing likewise is up. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Director have been commendable in many results obtained. Why exasperate the public with figures which they know to be meaningless in urgent categories of their daily living? (Boston Globe.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we come now to the matter of "Young Pritch." I do not know Mr. Vinson. I do not know "Young Pritch." But what I said about him was taken from the newspapers, and I hold clippings from them in my hand. I have here an article which appeared on the 14th day of July in the Washington Times. This is what Mr. Vinson himself said:

Stabilization Director Fred Vinson, former judge, former Representative, native Kentuckian, is "fed up" on stories about Edward Fretwell Pritchard, Jr., his assistant, Harvard

(class of 1935), who styles himself "the future Governor of Kentucky."

Mr. President, there certainly cannot be any disgrace, there cannot be anything wrong in a Senator getting up and saying that Mr. Pritchard aspired to be a future Governor of Kentucky, when the newspaper says that he aspires to be the future Governor of Kentucky. Certainly it cannot be a disgrace to be Governor of Kentucky, because the man who was just elected Governor of Kentucky, Mr. Willis, is well known to me, and is an outstanding citizen, not only of Kentucky, but of the entire United States of America, and in my judgment will make an outstanding Governor of that great State.

The article in the Washington Times-Herald continues:

Rotund Ed, or "Pritch" as classmates remember the 260-pound rosy-cheeked, coal-black-haired extrovert, has been getting the credit for writing opinions for Supreme Court Associate Justice Frankfurter, whose secretary he was. He also got the credit for upsetting the wage board award to the railroad employees and with issuing prematurely the meat roll-back subsidy plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YOUNG MAN GOES TO TOWN

Stabilization Director Fred Vinson, former judge, former Representative, native Kentuckian, is fed up on stories about Edward Fretwell Pritchard, Jr., his assistant, Harvard (class of 1935), who styles himself "the future Governor of Kentucky."

Rotund Ed, or Pritch, as classmates remember the 260-pound rosy-cheeked, coal-black-haired extrovert, has been getting the credit for writing opinions for Supreme Court Associate Justice Frankfurter, whose secretary he was. He also got the credit for upsetting the wage board award to the railroad employees and with issuing prematurely the meat roll-back subsidy plan.

Judge Vinson, who roomed with Ed's father at Center College, Kentucky, says:

"I have known my assistant since he was 10 years old. He went to Princeton and later to Harvard. He won honors at both schools. His uncle, Watt Pritchard, was a circuit court judge in Kentucky. The family came to the State in 1800 and has had many outstanding lawyers and judges among them. Personally, I am a cranky sort of individual who stands upon his own two feet. I personally handled the rail wage matter under the hold-the-line order and Judge Byrnes' (Jimmie) stabilization order. It was up to me to review the decision of the emergency panel, and I did. I signed the press release on the roll-back order on meat."

The judge added he wants the record straight on his own protege, who is IV-F in the draft, with a fine memory, a great reader, a brilliant man, extremely sensitive about the "ribbing" he has been getting from all concerned. He added he hopes his statement will close the record on "Big Pritch," who is here to stay as long as needed.

Judge Vinson is a man with tremendous drive. Ed seems to fit in well with one who has such drive. In his 5 years on the bench the judge has been reversed only twice, once in the Viereck case.

Ed's career has been fast and furious. Starting in 1939 with Justice Frankfurter, Ed had just left the LA FOLLETTE Civil Liber-

ties Committee as investigator. He went to Justice Department, then to John Lord O'Brian in W. P. B., next to Justice Byrnes in O. E. S., thence to Judge Vinson. One of Ed's neatest tricks has been to sit in on the sessions of the nine-man advisory committee meeting alternate Fridays at Justice Byrnes' call. On this committee are William Green, Phil Murray, Jim Patton, Eric Johnson, Ed O'Neal, and Ralph Flanders.

Ed has been all ears when the labor boys have spoken, written profuse notes on their remarks. When mere industry or business has spoken Ed has folded his hands across his 3-foot wide chest, looked at the ceiling and closed his John Lewis like eyes. Pritchard got in the War Mobilization set-up about the time Fred Searles went over from W. P. B.

He is a politician of no mean ability. He made himself conspicuous at Princeton by putting the Democratic club in the groove as a vote-getting machine. Until recently Ed was a frequent diner at an inn near State Department.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, certainly all I have said about this man being unable to stand up in the Army is borne out by the newspaper clipping I hold in my hand. The clipping is from the same newspaper, and the article was published on August 28, 1943. It reads in part as follows:

Discharged from the Army after 1 month of service—most of it in Fort Custer Hospital—300-pound Edward F. Pritchard, who once dubbed himself a "barrel," is back in Washington with the opportunity, if he wants it, of returning to his former post as key assistant to Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson.

Mr. President, I also have a clipping from a newspaper published on November 16, 1943. In the column known as the Roundup, the statement was made:

We notice Stabilization Director Vinson's Ed Pritchard and Attorney General Biddle's Herbert Weschler have lunch in a Tenth Street buffet.

Strangely enough, Mr. President, about the same time we find that Hammel's Restaurant, at 416 Tenth Street NW., was the subject of an announcement by District of Columbia O. P. A. officials, described in the following language in a newspaper article:

District O. P. A. officials last night announced a loan of 65,000 meat, fats, and cheese points to Hammel's Restaurant, 416 Tenth Street NW.

Mr. President, I do not claim that Mr. Pritchard used them all, but I simply mention the fact for what it may be worth, and because the distinguished Senator has said that I said some things about him which were not borne out by the facts. Perhaps these newspaper clippings are all wrong, but in any event I have them.

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, I have not had the experience that some men in public life have had. When I was sent to the Senate, I was not sent here by any political machine to which I owe any allegiance. I do not owe Harry Hopkins anything. He did all he could to defeat me in North Dakota. I desire to say that if there is a man for whom I have the utmost contempt it is Harry Hopkins. I say that Harry Hopkins' presence in the White House at Washington these last months has done more

to wreck the President of the United States of America than has any other man. I say I have a perfect right to criticize Harry Hopkins, Judge Vinson, Ed Pritchard, or anyone else, so long as I conscientiously believe they should be criticized.

Of course, Mr. President, my views may change as I go along in life. It may be that after I have been in Washington for 2 or 3 terms, after I have been in the Senate so long that I have forgotten about the common people in my State, after my views change, if they do change, I will take a different attitude. I am not as fortunate as the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. Why, Mr. President, there sits a great man, a man who has had a variety of experience for years and years and years, a man who is close to the White House, a man who is a right-hand man to the President of the United States, a man who day after day after day is called into consultation by the President of the United States, possibly the most powerful figure in the world today. So it is natural that my viewpoint may be somewhat different from that of my distinguished colleague.

My sympathies are all with the railroad employees. Somehow or other, I found in my experience, slight as it was, as Governor of the State of North Dakota, that the railroads were able to take care of themselves. Perhaps after I have attended some parties given in my honor when I get to be 66 years old, such as the one given the other day for my distinguished friend, I shall have the same viewpoint, too.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington Times-Herald for Monday, November 22—a great page headed "Society." Of course, Mr. President, society does not mean anything to me, because it happens that I do not care anything about it. But, Mr. President, I was very much interested in noting that my distinguished friend, whom I respect so much, was entertained by Mrs. Edward Stotesbury and James H. R. Cromwell. They are well-known people—one the widow of a great railroad magnate and the other a man who married the richest girl in the world, Doris Duke. Just see, Mr. President, how this paper says Mrs. Stotesbury was dressed:

Mrs. Stotesbury, whose parties are as few as they are superb, received wearing a gown of heavy black satin that fell into deep shining folds under a jacket of black dotted net. Her six-strand pearl necklace with its diamond clasp matched her diamond and pearl earrings.

Mr. President, some might think it is a remarkable thing for a man, in a few short years after coming to Washington, to be entertained by people of that prominence. But, Mr. President, I was very, very proud of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. It shows us how gallant the southern gentlemen are.

The article continues:

There were so many persons present it was difficult to hear her beautifully modulated voice when speeches accompanied the cutting of a high-tiered cake with one sparkling candle. But we did hear Senator BARKLEY

boasting of his 39 years, interrupted by the lovely lady saying, "You see, Senator, I am proud to say that I am in my eightieth year."

Mr. President, only a man skilled in diplomacy, skilled in the arts of social finesse, could have given such a beautiful reply as the one given by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, when he replied—and I quote further from the article:

"Indeed, I don't see," answered the Senator, "but I hope you will live to look it."

Mr. President, it seems to me that Senators from Kentucky become very, very distinguished after they get here, and I imagine I would have to stay here for 20, or 40, or 50 years before I could possibly acquire their social arts; because here is another article, this one published on November 17, telling about the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky. The article is written by a lady called Elsa Maxwell. She said:

Yesterday Senator CHANDLER arrived in town for a few hours and called me up to ask me to lunch. I had already arranged to lunch with Elsie Woodward at the Colony, so I suggested to "Happy," that fiery Kentuckian, to check his toga in the cloak room and join us. Believe it or not, one of our most aggressive, fighting Democratic Senators had never heard of the Colony.

"Honey," said "Happy," "I only want a glass of milk and a chicken sandwich; but I'll certainly pay for you-all, if you'll allow me." So "Happy" came to the Colony and looked on in amazement. What went on there beat anything he'd seen on Capitol Hill. He was very interesting. He's a great guy—though he did spill the beans a bit too freely, so some think, after his return from the tour of England and our foreign battle fronts with his four colleagues.

I think "Happy" is an honest man, and I think he is pro-American—which really doesn't make him anti-British necessarily. He voted for the war—though he's opposed completely to the New Deal. He voted for the Army. He voted for Lend-Lease. And he backed Tom Connally to the hilt on his resolution which included the Moscow Pact.

So when "Happy" tells me that MacArthur had only 60 bombers to drive out the Japs in his present campaign, as compared to the 1,000 we use on a single raid in Europe; that Generals Chennault and Stilwell had only 90 bombers to bomb the Japs from their Chinese bases, it gives you an uneasy feeling at the bottom of your spine.

"Happy" swears by everything he holds holy that we are not getting enough supplies or planes to China, nor materials to fortify our Chinese bases. If this is true, I, for one, think it should be brought out into the open—immediately, if not sooner. Anyway, Senator CHANDLER thought the Colony a most unusual place. Maybe the Colony thought the Senator a most unusual man. At any rate, I think he's the "cat's whiskers!"

Reverting to the statements made by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the official statement issued by Fred M. Vinson, signed by him as Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, X-22591, dated November 8, 1943. O. W. I. release 2694, in which he delivers an opinion in the nonoperating railway employee wage adjustment case.

Mr. President, I repeat that, reared in humble circumstances, and proud of it,

I was sent here by the people of my State, the farmers, the laborers, and the small businessmen, to represent the interests of the common man. Whenever in my judgment, under my oath, I feel that anyone, whether he be appointed by the President of the United States or not, has acted improperly, it is my duty to object. A group of 1,000,000 men obeyed the law and went before the very boards which the law created. Many weeks were consumed in taking testimony, and the railroads and the workers did the unusual thing of agreeing. They have been to the White House, as they say, and at one time the President himself agreed. I say that I speak in their behalf when I object to a man like Fred Vinson coming along and setting aside that agreement.

I like the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He did me the courtesy of saying to me a few days ago that he objected to the talk to which he directed the attention of the Senate this afternoon. I appreciated it. But, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to the fact—so far as I know—neither my distinguished colleague [Mr. NYE] nor I—certainly not during the time I have been in the Senate—has ever been discourteous either to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky or to any other Member of this body. I said to him at that time that if he would point out any part of the talk to which he objected, I should be glad to verify it, and would rise on the floor of the Senate and correct it if it were not true.

To repeat, I am not attacking the honesty or integrity of Judge Vinson. I am availing myself of my constitutional right—nay, doing my duty—to call the attention of the American people to the fact that 1,000,000 men carried out the law of the land and agreed with the railroad executives, and that that agreement was set aside by one stroke of Vinson's pen. In their behalf I object. Certainly there is no other place to which I could go, no other place where I could call the matter to the attention of my fellow Senators. As I view it, I simply did my duty as I saw it, according to my conscience. I have no quarrel with any other Senator, no matter how he may feel upon this or any other subject.

Let me repeat that I do not know Judge Vinson. I do not know Mr. Pritchard. I have seen John Lewis only once in my life, and that was many months ago. I simply tried, as I got the stories from the newspapers, to make an honest presentation of the question upon the floor of the Senate. I do not know of a single word which I used to which any Member of the Senate could honestly take exception. I can readily understand how badly the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky feels. Those men are friends of his. He has known them for a long time. He likes them. But Mr. President, I have found in public life that when one assumes a public office and takes the oath to be a trustee for the people the time may come when his

very best friend and he may have to part company.

I like to picture in my mind that bold, fighting champion of the people of Kentucky personified by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky 10 or 15 years ago, when we used to read about him in the newspapers out West. I repeat, I like him. I respect him; and, Mr. President, if I were in serious personal trouble I would as soon go to my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and lay my trouble honestly and squarely before him as to go to many others who here in Washington call themselves my friends.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only part of the Senator's remarks to which I wish to advert is that part in which he referred to a social occasion in my honor on last Sunday.

It is incredible to me that a Member of this great body should seek, by that cheap sort of device, to create a prejudice against me because a very charming lady saw fit to give me a birthday party on last Sunday.

Mrs. Stotesbury is 80 years old, she says. I have no reason to doubt it, except that she does not look it. She is one of the most gracious, kindly, and big-hearted women it has been my privilege to know. Everyone who has ever come in contact with her testifies to that characteristic. I do not know anything about her wealth or lack of wealth. I never inquired about it from anyone. I do not know why she cultivated a friendship for me which would actuate her in giving me a little birthday party; but I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that I am proud that she thought that much of me. There is no favor on the face of the earth that she ever asked of me. There is no favor on earth that I could grant to her. She does not need me for anything. It is a beautiful thing now and then for a charming American woman who has nothing to ask of anyone, who has no reason to expect any reward for her friendship, to provide an hour or two of entertainment for friends of all kinds, rich and poor, in honor of someone whom she happens to respect.

I am very proud of my friends, whether they be rich or poor. I can say, for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota, that while in my 30 years' experience and service in Congress I have enjoyed the friendship of many men and women, no friendship that I have ever enjoyed, and none that I ever expect to enjoy, has ever influenced or will ever influence me in the slightest degree in the performance of my duty as a United States Senator.

I can say also to the Senator from North Dakota that since I have been in public life I have not made a race for any office in which I was not enthusiastically endorsed, supported, and worked for by hundreds of thousands—even millions—of working people in the United States, including railroad employees and all other kinds of employees. I am satisfied that when my record has been examined in the minutest degree and has been combed by a fine-tooth

comb, no one who is a friend of the American workingman will fail to find that I have been uniformly his friend and supporter. I repeat that I deeply appreciate the gracious gesture of courtesy extended to me by a charming woman who has no axes to grind and no favors to ask. She would be the last woman in America to expect me to advocate or to oppose anything in the way of a public measure or public policy simply because, out of the kindness of her heart, she honored my birthday a few days ago.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that regardless of its aspect so far as I am personally concerned, the Senator from North Dakota was deliberately striking below the belt when he by inference attacked a good woman in this city for showing me the courtesy of a little entertainment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this debate, but I do desire merely to emphasize, by underlining, what seems to me to be the crux of the matter, contained in an admission by the Senator from North Dakota, after his invidious remarks about Judge Vinson made the other day and repeated today. The Senator from North Dakota wound up with the admission that he did not know Judge Vinson. I think he said he had never seen him. He certainly demonstrated, in his two effusions on this floor, that he does not know anything about Fred Vinson. I think that that statement alone, Mr. President, can stand as an answer to the abuse of Judge Vinson by the Senator from North Dakota. I think the fact that he does not know Judge Vinson, and that he does not know anything about him, will certainly not stand in the future against the repeated expressions of esteem, admiration, and affection which have been made many times, both by those at the other end of the Capitol and by those at this end of the Capitol, as well as by those in executive positions who have known Judge Vinson, who know his high character, his great ability, his great public spirit, and the willingness for sacrifice which he exhibited when he accepted his present position.

It so happens that I do not agree with Judge Vinson on one of the matters presently in controversy which has to do with the railroad wage dispute. I believe he is wrong. But, I certainly do not intend to sit silent on this floor and hear Judge Vinson abused over a matter involving a difference of opinion on a great public question.

Mr. President, I assume it is not necessary for any Member of this body to express the opinion which all of us hold, with possibly very few exceptions, concerning the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the distinguished majority leader. I think it was highly improper—I am expressing my own personal opinion as a Senator on this floor—I think it was highly improper for the Senator from North Dakota to undertake during the discussion of a matter having to do with something else, to besmirch and be-

little the Senator from Kentucky because of a gracious social act on the part of a lady who happens to reside in this town in paying honor and tribute to the Senator from Kentucky on his birthday. The Senator from Kentucky does not need any defense from me or anyone else. As one individual Senator I wish to express my indignation over dragging into such a debate as this a pleasant social occasion in honor, very justly and very kindly, of the birthday of the Senator from Kentucky.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, November 25 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Erline R. Scruggs, Coffeetown.
Willie Mae Hancock, Ethelsville.
Averell L. Purvis, Spring Hill.

ALASKA

Lew M. Williams, Wrangell.

CALIFORNIA

Ella S. Anderson, Auberry.
Gladys E. Beard, Yountville.

CONNECTICUT

Charles J. Schmid, Amston.
John T. Collins, Poquonock.
Dorothy E. Wilkinson, Tariffville.

DELAWARE

Anna A. Anderson, Ocean View.

FLORIDA

Eva R. Vaughn, Century.
Thomas M. Crouch, Fort White.

IDAHO

Charles I. Bartlett, Craigmont.

ILLINOIS

Fred M. Johnson, Jonesboro.

INDIANA

Harold W. Barker, Cayuga.

KANSAS

Fern T. Fencil, Haddam.

MAINE

Frances F. Quinn, Ellsworth Falls.
Hollis M. Smith, Mount Desert.
John M. Perkins, Sherman Station.
Thelma B. Mahar, West Pembroke.
Ina S. Knight, West Scarborough.

MARYLAND

Florence K. Hazard, Branchville.
Eleanor S. Canter, Charlotte Hall.
Aquilla Streaker, Daniels.
Esther M. Dennis, Willards.
John H. Dwyer, Worton.

MISSISSIPPI

Fred G. Martin, Dorsey.

MONTANA

Geneva Heath, Wilsall.

NEW MEXICO

Dave G. Cliver, Santa Rita.

NEW YORK

Ruth Larsen, King Ferry.

NORTH CAROLINA

E. Burke Gunter, Hamlet.

OREGON

Clare M. Sawyer, Drain.
Mildred B. Croner, Oakridge.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph A. Barnes, Ardmore.
Laura C. Blatt, West Leesport.
Millie E. Moore, Westover.
William B. Snyder, Windsor.

VIRGINIA

Edith E. Payne, Falmouth.
Mildred K. Smith, Sterling.
Percy Bradshaw, Zuni.

WASHINGTON

Lila Luella Henry, Bow.
Nancy J. Nance, Brush Prairie.
Josephine F. Johnson, Endicott.
Thomas W. Tait, Gig Harbor.
Ruth F. Walters, Moxee City.
John T. Scott, North Bend.
Theo V. Steele, Port Gamble.